



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

US
5263
97B

An Appeal on Slavery - 1835

U. S. 5263, 97
B

Harvard College Library



FROM THE BRIGHT LEGACY

One half the income from this Legacy, which was received in 1880 under the will of

JONATHAN BROWN BRIGHT

of Waltham, Massachusetts, is to be expended for books for the College Library. The other half of the income is devoted to scholarships in Harvard University for the benefit of descendants of

HENRY BRIGHT, JR.,

who died at Watertown, Massachusetts, in 1686. In the absence of such descendants, other persons are eligible to the scholarships. The will requires that this announcement shall be made in every book added to the Library under its provisions.

from his affectionate friend
W. L. Roy, Underland

APPEAL

ON THE

SUBJECT OF SLAVERY;

ADDRESSED TO

THE MEMBERS OF THE NEW ENGLAND AND NEW HAMPSHIRE
CONFERENCES OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

TOGETHER WITH A

DEFENCE OF SAID APPEAL,

IN WHICH IS SHOWN THE

SIN OF HOLDING PROPERTY IN MAN.

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY DAVID H. ELA,
No. 19, Washington Street.

1835.

WS 5263.97

B V



Keightley

W

A P P E A L.

DEAR BRETHREN—

If any apology be necessary for our troubling you in this manner, we trust a sufficient one may be found in the importance of the subject upon which we address you.

It is a command of the infinite God, that we should *open our mouths and plead a righteous judgment for the poor and the needy, who are dumb, and appointed to destruction* (Prov. xxxi. 9); and it is in obedience to this command that we now appeal to you in the behalf of more than two millions of our fellow citizens, who, we know, are made *poor and needy* by the bondage which they are compelled to suffer, and who are *dumb* in a most affecting sense, inasmuch as they are not, and never have been, permitted to speak for themselves.

On the subject of Negro Slavery, as its exists in the United States, we think we can say that we have bestowed the most serious attention for a number of years past. It has interested our sincerest sympathies and prayers, both for the enslaver and the enslaved; nor are we conscious of having neglected any means which might serve to afford us a consistent and enlightened view of the question which we now wish to propose for you consideration.

But it is not the cause of two millions five hundred thousand slaves that we plead merely, nor yet the millions of their posterity which are yet to live and endure the evils of an unjust and violent bondage; but we plead for the Methodist Episcopal Church, of which we are, unworthy indeed, but we trust devoted members. We feel that we should prove ourselves utterly unfit for the relation which we sustain to this church, either as members or ministers, were we longer to keep silence and do nothing to avert the dreadful evils with which Slavery threatens, so evidently, her peace and prosperity. We cannot look on with indifference and see some of the plainest rules of her discipline outraged and set at defiance, though we were to leave out of the account the part which so many of her members and ministers have taken in the unnatural and anti-Christian work of Slavery.

In approaching this subject, we are conscious of no unkind feelings towards any who may differ from us in opinion; we wish to "speak the truth in love," to discharge a solemn duty which we owe to God our maker, to the church of which we are members, and to the thousands of the poor slaves from whose minds the lights of science and religion are shut out, and who are held in a bondage more oppressive and cruel in many respects, than any other of the kind which ever prevailed among men.

THE QUESTION STATED.

1. It is not necessary that we should here enter into a detailed account of the evils of Slavery, or that we should attempt a particular discussion of its principles; nor is it our design to answer all the apologies which have been made by professing *Christians* and *Christian ministers* for the system. We wish simply to mention some of the most prominent features of the system of Slavery as it exists in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and to lay before you some of the reasons which force upon our minds the solemn conviction, that as a church and as individuals, we are far behind our duty in relation to this thing; that no man has, or can have, a right to hold a fellow man for one moment in bondage as a piece of merchantable PROPERTY, to take the hire of his labor against his will, or to refuse him the means of social, moral and intellectual improvement; that personal liberty, that is, liberty to enjoy the fruits of one's own labor, is the inalienable gift of the infinite God to every human being; therefore, to take away this liberty where no crime has been committed, is a direct violation of a right which belongs to God alone. Hence, every American citizen who retains a fellow being in bondage as a piece of PROPERTY, and takes the price of his labor without his consent, is guilty of a *crime* which cannot be reconciled with the spirit of the Christian religion; and it is the more criminal for a professing Christian or Christian minister to do this, because they thus afford their support to an unjust and violent system of oppressions; a system which always has been, is now, and always will be, the unyielding enemy of virtue, knowledge and religion; a system which leaves more than one-sixth part of the citizens of these United States without any adequate protection for their persons; a system which opens the way for and fosters the worst of passions and crimes—such as prostitution, adultery, murder, discord, theft, insurrections, indolence, insensibility to the claims of justice and mercy, pride, and a wicked contempt for the rights and feelings of a large proportion of our fellow men. Its natural tendency upon all who become the victims of its oppression, is to benumb the sensibilities of the mind, to corrupt and deaden the conscience, and to kill the soul. Hence we say the system is *wrong*, it is *cruel* and *unjust*, in all its parts and principles, and that no Christian can consistently lend his influence or example for one moment in support of it, and consequently it should be abandoned now and **FOREVER**.

THE DIFFERENT KINDS OF TESTIMONY BY WHICH WE PROVE,
THAT THIS KIND OF SLAVE-HOLDING IS A SIN AGAINST GOD.

2. In this view of the subject we shall show you that we are not alone, but we are most firmly supported by the Bible, by the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by the opinions of Wesley, of Dr. Clarke, of Watson, and by the testimony of the British Conference, and the unanimous voice of the Wesleyan Connection in England, including the whole of the preachers and people. We choose to confine ourselves to the above named testimonies, not indeed because there are not a multitude of other collateral ones, but rather because we wish to examine the subject in its connection with the *Methodist Episcopal Church*. Hundreds of her ministers and thousands of her members are enslavers of their fel-

low men, as they have been for years. They hold the bodies and the souls of men, women and children,—many of whom are members of the same church with themselves,—in abject slavery, and still retain their standing without any censure on this account.

THE BIBLE CONDEMN'S THIS KIND OF SLAVERY.

3. We say, then, that the testimony of the infinite God is against the system of Slavery. *And he that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death.* Exodus, xxi. 16. "By this law," says Dr. A. Clarke, "every man-stealer, and every receiver of the stolen person, should lose his life: no matter whether the latter stole the man himself or gave money to a *slave-captain* or negro-dealer to steal him for him." Here the enslaver of the human species is pronounced worthy of death, and those who affect to justify this crime by the various excuses which they make for it, do but show thereby that they have some apprehension of the justice of the above law; else why attempt to excuse it in any way? It is true, that a certain kind of servitude was permitted by the Jewish economy, but God never gave the Jews nor any other nation or individual the permission to *steal* men, nor any thing like a permission for any one to buy or sell those or their posterity who had been *stolen*. Concerning the Slavery which existed among the Jews, the pious and learned commentator above quoted remarks:—"They certainly had privileges which did not extend either to *sojourners* or to *hired servants*; therefore their situation was incomparably better than the situation of the slaves under different European governments, of whose souls their pitiless possessors, in general, take no care, while they themselves venture to profess the Christian religion, and quote the Mosaic law in vindication of their system of Slavery.—How preposterous is such conduct! and how intolerable!" But there was no such thing as *involuntary, unending Slavery* among the Jews; nor indeed was there any kind of Slavery tolerated by their law, which bears any resemblance for its cruelty and oppression to that which prevails among professing Christians in these United States.

4. *If a man be found stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel, and maketh merchandise of him, or selleth him; then that thief shall die; and thou shalt put evil away from among you.* Deut. xxiv. 7. Now just as sure as any man in the United States can prove that his slaves are his merchantable *property*, just so sure the word of God pronounces that property stolen, and the possession of it a crime for which any Israelite was doomed to suffer death.

5. *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.* Matt. xxii. 39. By this command we are obligated not only to pity a fellow creature when we see him in distress, but also to do the utmost in our power to give him the same instruction which we enjoy ourselves, and to promote, as far as possible, his temporal and spiritual felicity. But how can it be shown that those *Christians*, those *Methodist ministers*, love their neighbors as themselves, when they have had slaves in their families and on their plantations for years, and the profits of whose labors they have been reaping, and yet they never have furnished them with a *Bible*, nor suffered them to learn

one single letter of the alphabet! Now it is worse than no excuse for such to say that the laws will not permit the instruction of their slaves. Suppose the laws were to prohibit their praying for their slaves? Would there not be precisely as much reason for their implicit obedience to such a law, as there is for obeying the one which prohibits them from reading the Bible? Why, it is too plain to need illustration, that each of the slave states has just as much right to prohibit the spiritual instruction of the slaves, as any of them have to forbid their instruction in letters and general science. We wonder what the Methodist enslavers would do, in case the states where they live should pass laws making it penal for them to pray for their slaves, or to attempt their spiritual instruction in any way?

6. *Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.* Matt. vii. 12. On this and the foregoing passage it may be remarked, that if, as some attempt to show, they do not condemn Slavery, then they do not condemn murder, they do not condemn adultery, nor theft, nor any other crime. If the system of Slavery may be justified in view of these and similar passages, merely because Jesus Christ did not mention it by name, then by the same principle we may justify offensive and wicked wars, the various games in vogue among the Greeks and Romans anciently, and so we may justify bull-baiting and the bloody gladiatorial exhibitions which also prevailed among those nations when our Saviour was upon earth—neither of which practices were mentioned by Christ particularly, for the most obvious reason, that he exercised his ministry among the Jews, where such games and cruel exhibitions were not known.

7. *Masters give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.*—Col. iv.1. This text alone, were it properly obeyed, would annihilate the system of slavery from the church and the nation. And is it *just and equal*, when the poor slaves are compelled, often by the stroke of the club or the cow-hide, to toil in weariness and want, as long as they live, till they finally drop into the grave, without their ever being paid one penny as an equivalent for their labor?

8. *Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou called being a servant? care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise, also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant. Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men.*—1 Cor. vii. 20—23. From these words two things are apparent: first, that Christianity does not alter the civil connection which one man may sustain to another, merely by his embracing it. Secondly, Slavery is here condemned, inasmuch as the apostle commands such as were slaves to embrace the first opportunity which might be afforded them for obtaining their liberty; *if thou mayest be made free, use it rather*; and he further enjoined it upon all such as are free never to become slaves; *be not ye the servants or slaves of men.* But such as were in slavery, need not on this account be absolutely prevented from becoming Christians; *art thou called being a servant? care not for it:* that is, do not let this hinder your accepting of salvation; you may believe, nevertheless, and be saved. What the apostle would have said, had any of those

slaves of whom he here speaks been prohibited from reading the epistles which he wrote to them, it is much more easy to conceive, than it is to prove, as many have attempted to do, that in the above language he justifies *such a system of Slavery*.

THE BIBLE CONDEMNS SLAVERY IN PRECISELY THE SAME WAY THAT IT CONDEMNS MANY OTHER THINGS, WHICH ARE ALLOWED BY ALL CHRISTIANS TO BE SINS AGAINST GOD.

9. With just as much propriety a Christian might take to himself a half a dozen wives and appeal to the Bible to justify his conduct. He might tell us of Solomon, of David, of Jacob, and of Abraham, whose example he was following! And he might exclaim with precisely as much consistency—"There is not one command in the Bible against polygamy," as the Christian enslaver does—"There is nothing in the Bible against Slavery." The truth is, polygamy, and gladiatorial exhibitions, lotteries, theatres, rum making and rum drinking, offensive wars, and a thousand other abominations, equally as vile and hateful in the sight of God, may be justified by the Bible in one and the very same way that the enslaver refers to the Bible to justify the robbery and oppression of which he is guilty. There is no getting away from this conclusion; it is as clear as the glaring light of the sun at noon day.

10. So when St. Peter directs servants to be subject to their masters. Now if these directions may be quoted to justify Slavery, then we challenge any man in the world to show by the same rules of interpretation, that the command of Christ, that his disciples should pray for their persecutors, does not justify persecution. And yet the words of St. Peter are often put into the mouths of the poor slaves by their masters to induce them to believe, that the slaves, both male and female, must implicitly obey their masters, and do and consent to every thing they say!

THERE IS A MOST PALPABLE INCONSISTENCY, IN A CHRISTIAN'S ATTEMPTING TO JUSTIFY SLAVERY FROM THE WORD OF GOD!

11. It does really seem to us as one of the strangest inconsistencies which ever interested the attention of intelligent beings, when a professing Christian attempts to defend the system of Slavery from the Bible! Slavery defended by the Bible!! A system which outrages every principle of the gospel, and sets at defiance the laws of God, supported by the Bible! A system which perpetuates the traffic in human souls, and human flesh and blood,—which is nurtured by the groans and tears of husbands and wives, parents and children, brothers and sisters, parted and torn asunder—defended by the Christian Scriptures!! A system which robs and grinds to the dust more than two millions of American citizens, which brutalizes their minds, and shuts from their intellects the lights of science and religion, upheld and supported by the word of God!! A system which is made up of the highest kind of theft, which defrauds the poor and friendless, destroys feminine modesty, and corrupts all classes in society where it prevails, with every shade of vice and irreligion,—such a system loved and cherished by the followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, and to defend it they quote the testimony of that God whose name is *mercy*, and whose bowels *melt* with *love*!! * * * * *

THE DISCIPLINE OF THE M. E. CHURCH IS OPPOSED TO SLAVERY, THE SAME AS IT IS OPPOSED TO EVERY OTHER SIN.

12. That the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church opposes Slavery, every one must know who has ever read it. Some apparent inconsistencies may be readily detected in this book, in relation to this subject, it is true, but we shall see, nevertheless, upon examination, that the rule which it contains now, as well as those which it has contained heretofore, was designed to prevent the existence of Slavery in this Church. The first rule we have on this subject is found in chap. ii. sec. 1, under the head of "The Nature, Design, and General Rules of our United Societies." As if to insure the greater attention, it is printed in *italic*, and comes in with some other rules as follows—"It is expected of all who continue therein [our societies, or in the M. E. Church] that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation, by avoiding evil of every kind, especially that which is most generally practised, such as the taking of the name of God in vain, the profaning the day of the Lord, drunkenness, or drinking spirituous liquors unless in cases of necessity, *the buying and selling of men, women and children, with an intention to enslave them*, [this formerly read—men, women, or children] fighting, quarrelling, brother going to law with brother;—these are the general rules of our united societies: all which we are taught of God to observe, even in his written word, and all these we know his Spirit writes on truly awakened hearts."

From the above, two things appear evident and plain:—1. That no person who continues to profane the name of God, or to profane the Lord's day, or to *enslave men, women and children*, can be continued a member of the Methodist E. Church, agreeably to the Discipline (for this Rule appears to be against the *INTENTION to enslave* one in any way.) 2. That no person who continues to *enslave men, women and children* has been truly awakened to a sense of his condition, as it must be, we conceive, as really wrong to continue one in slavery as it is to reduce one to this state.

13. Our General Rules were drawn up by the Rev. John and Charles Wesley, for the Methodist societies in England. When the M. E. Church was organized in this country in 1784, the same Rules were adopted, with a few alterations, and the one on Slavery, we believe, was then added to them, and they have been in force in this Church from that time to the present; and the highest ecclesiastical authority in this church has no power to alter or change them in any way. See Dis. chap. i. sec. 3. Hence, we suppose that, whatever other rules there may be in the Discipline, they cannot fairly be interpreted into such a sense as will contravene the design of the above Rule, because the General Rule must be paramount law in all cases, as it cannot be changed, nor revoked, in any way.

14. We are aware that, in one other place it is declared, that "no slave-holder shall be eligible to any official station in our church hereafter, where the laws of the state in which he lives will admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom." But suppose a member of our Church becomes a slave-holder, that is, receives "men, women, and children" into his possession as his property, with an "intention to **ENSLAVE** them,"

without either buying or selling them? Does he not contravene the General Rule in such a case which forbids the "intention to enslave" another?

15. Again, it is added, "When any travelling preacher becomes an owner of a slave or slaves, by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in our Church, unless he execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slaves, conformably to the laws of the state in which he lives." Dig, part ii, sec. 9. Now it seems remarkable, that our General Rule on Slavery is the only one of the General Rules which makes the **INTENTION**, to do an act, **criminal**, and hence, we conclude, that *an intention* to enslave the human species, or an "intention" to sustain the same relation to the enslaved, which was sustained at first, by him who reduced them to this state, must be a violation of the spirit and design of our General Rule.

16. But suppose a travelling preacher buys some dozen or twenty "men, women and children, with an intention of enslaving them," in a state where the laws do not "admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slaves to enjoy freedom,"—what then? Do the laws of such states change the nature of the "**GREAT EVIL**" of which the Discipline declares the M. E. Church is "as much as ever convinced?" And would not such a case really contravene the General Rule? Or, suppose again, that the Discipline had some similar permissions with the above, in respect to some other sin mentioned in the "general Rules," declaring it to be a *great evil* of which they were "as much as ever convinced," and then adding as follows:—"No Sabbath breaker shall be eligible to any official station in our Church hereafter, where the laws of the state in which he lives do not legalize Sabbath breaking."

"When any travelling preacher becomes a drunkard, by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in our Church, unless he can show that the laws of the state in which he lives sanction drunkenness."

If there were, or could, be any additional statements with regard to these crimes which are mentioned in the General Rules, should we feel ourselves at liberty to interpret them so as to contravene the Rules, which our General Conference declare shall not be "changed or revoked?"

17. And we do not see but that the Discipline might have made just such provision for any other "great evil" or sin prohibited in our General Rules, with the very same propriety that it has made the above for the "great evil" of Slavery? It does indeed make a distinction between the sin of slaveholding and some other sins "which are most generally practised," as it declares Slavery to be a "*great evil*," by which we understand it to mean, that slaveholding is a *greater evil* than any other sin mentioned in the general Rules, because it is not said thus of any other one sin mentioned in the Discipline.*

* The remarks, in the "Counter Appeal," concerning these specific rules, seem to be offered upon the supposition, that, had they been added to the Discipline by the General Conference, it might have been considered a virtual violation of one of the Restrictive Rules, which binds this body not to alter, or do away by any means, either of the General Rules; but as these specific rules were made before the Gen-

have lived out half their days. They are attended by overseers, who, if they think them dilatory, or any thing not so well done as it should be, whip them unmercifully; so that you may see their bodies long after waled and scarred from the shoulder to the waist. Did the Creator intend that the noblest creatures in the visible world should live such a life as this?

"As to the punishment inflicted on them, they sometimes chop off half a foot! after they are whipped till they are raw all over, some put pepper and salt upon them; some drop melted wax upon their skin, others cut off their ears, and constrain them to broil and eat them. For rebellion, that is, asserting their native liberty, which they have as much right to as the air they breathe, they fasten them down to the ground with crooked sticks on every limb, and then applying fire to the feet and hands, they burn them gradually to the head!"

"But will not the laws made in the colony prevent or redress all cruelty and oppression? Take a few of those laws for a specimen, and judge.

"In order to rivet the chain of Slavery, *the law of Virginia* ordains—'No slave shall be set free, upon any pretence whatever, except for some meritorious services, to be adjudged and allowed by the *Governor and Council*; and where any slave shall be set free by his owner, otherwise than is herein directed, the *church-wardens* of the parish wherein such negro shall reside for the space of one month, are hereby authorized and required to *take up and sell the said negro, by public outcry*.'

"After proclamation is issued against slaves that run away, it is lawful for any person whatsoever to kill and destroy such slaves by such ways and means as he shall think fit."

"We have seen already some of the ways and means which have been *thought fit* on such occasions: and many more might be mentioned. One man, when I was abroad, thought fit to *roast his slave alive*! But if the most natural act of running away from intolerable tyranny deserves such relentless severity, what punishment have those *lawmakers* to expect hereafter, on account of their own enormous offences?"

WESLEY DEFINED SLAVE-HOLDING AS A SIN AGAINST GOD, THE SAME AS WE DO.

24. "This is the plain, unaggravated matter of fact. Can these things be defended on the principles of even heathen honesty? Can they be reconciled, setting the Bible out of the question, with any degree of either justice or mercy?"

"The grand plea is, 'They are authorized by law.' But can law, human law, change the nature of things? Can it turn darkness into light, or evil into good? By no means. Notwithstanding ten thousand laws, right is right, and wrong is wrong. There must still remain an essential difference between justice and injustice, cruelty and mercy. So that I ask, Who can reconcile this treatment of the slaves, first and last, with either mercy or justice? where is the justice of inflicting the severest evils on those who have done us no wrong? of depriving those who never injured us in word or deed, of every comfort of life? of tearing them from their native country, and depriving them of liberty itself; to which an *Angolan* has the same natural right as an American, and on

which he sets as high a value? Where is the justice of taking away the lives of innocent, inoffensive men? murdering thousands of them in their own land by the hands of their own countrymen; and tens of thousands in that cruel slavery, to which they are so unjustly reduced?

WESLEY AND BLACKSTONE PROVE SLAVE-HOLDING TO BE A SIN, BY A COURSE OF REASONING WHICH NEVER HAS BEEN, AND NEVER CAN BE, REFUTED.

25. "But I strike at the root of this complicated villany. I absolutely deny all slave-holding to be consistent with any degree of natural justice. Judge Blackstone has placed this in the clearest light, as follows:

"The three origins of the right of Slavery assigned by Justinian are all built upon false foundations. 1. Slavery is said to arise from captivity in war. The conqueror having a right to the life of his captive, if he spares that, has a right to deal with him as he pleases. But this is untrue, that by the laws of nations a man has a right to kill his enemy. He has only a right to kill him in cases of absolute necessity, for self-defence. And it is plain this absolute necessity did not subsist, since he did not kill him, but made him prisoner. War itself is justifiable only on principles of self-preservation. Therefore it gives us no right over prisoners, but to hinder their hurting us by confining them. Much less can it give a right to torture, or kill, or even enslave an enemy, when the war is over. Since, therefore, the right of making our prisoners slaves, depends on a supposed right of slaughter, that foundation failing, the consequence which is drawn from it must fall likewise. 2. It is said, Slavery may begin by one man's selling himself to another. It is true, a man may sell himself to work for another; but he cannot sell himself to be a slave, as above defined. Every sale implies an equivalent given to the seller, in lieu of what he transfers to the buyer. But what equivalent can be given for life or liberty? His property, likewise, with the very price which he seems to receive, devolves to his master the moment he becomes his slave: in this case, therefore, the buyer gives nothing. Of what validity, then, can a sale be, which destroys the very principle upon which all sales are founded? 3. We are told that men may be *born slaves*, by being the children of slaves. But this, being built upon the two former false claims, must fall with them. If neither captivity nor contract, by the plain law of nature and reason, can reduce the parent to a state of Slavery, much less can they reduce the offspring. It clearly follows, that all

SLAVE-HOLDING IS UTTERLY INCONSISTENT WITH MERCY AND JUSTICE.

26. "That slaveholding is utterly inconsistent with mercy, is almost too plain to need a proof. It is said—'These negroes, being prisoners of war, our captains and factors buy them, merely to save them from being put to death. Is not this mercy?' I answer: 1. Did Hawkins, and many others, seize upon men, women and children, who were at peace in their own fields and houses, merely to save them from death? 2. Was it to save them from death, that they knocked out the brains of those they could not bring

away? 3. Who occasioned and fomented those wars, wherein these poor creatures were taken prisoners? Who excited them by money, by drink, by every possible means, to fall upon one another? Was it not themselves? They know in their own consciences it was, if they have any consciences left. 4. To bring the matter to a short issue—Can they say before God, that they ever took a single voyage, or brought a single African, from this motive? They cannot. *To get money, not to save lives, was the whole and sole spring of their motions.*

“But if this manner of procuring and treating slaves is not consistent with mercy or justice, yet there is a plea for it which every man of business will acknowledge to be quite sufficient. On meeting an eminent statesman in the lobby of the House of Commons, one said—‘You have been long talking about justice and equity; pray, which is this bill? equity or justice?’ He answered very short and plain—‘Damn justice; it is necessity.’ Here also the slave-holder fixes his foot; here he rests the strength of his cause. ‘If it is not quite right, yet it is *must* be so; there is an absolute *necessity for it*. It is necessary we should procure slaves; and when we have procured them, it is necessary to use them with severity, considering their stupidity, stubbornness, and wickedness.’ You stumble at the threshold; I deny that villainy is ever necessary. It is impossible that it should ever be necessary for any reasonable creature to violate all the laws of justice, mercy, and truth. No circumstances can make it necessary for a man to burst in sunder all the ties of humanity. *It can never be necessary for a rational being to sink himself below a brute.* *A man can be under no necessity of degrading himself into a wolf.* The absurdity of the supposition is so glaring, that one would wonder that any one could help seeing it.

27. “What is necessary? and to what end? It may be answered—‘The whole method now used by the original purchasers of Africans is necessary to the furnishing our colonies yearly with a hundred thousand slaves.’ I grant *this* is necessary to *that end*. But how is *that end* necessary? How will you prove it necessary that one hundred, that *one* of those slaves should be procured? ‘It is necessary to my gaining a hundred thousand pounds.’ Perhaps so: but how is *this* necessary? It is very possible you might be both a better and a happier man, if you had not a quarter of it. I deny that your gaining one thousand is necessary either to your present or eternal happiness. ‘But you must allow these slaves are necessary for the cultivation of our islands: inasmuch as white men are not able to labor in hot climates.’ I answer—1. It were better that all those islands should remain uncultivated for ever; yea, it were more desirable that they were altogether sunk in the depth of the sea, than that they should be cultivated at so high a price, as the violation of justice, mercy, and truth. 2. But the supposition on which you ground your argument is false. White men are able to labor in hot climates, provided they are temperate both in meat and drink, and that they inure themselves to it, by degrees. *I speak no more than I know by experience.*—The summer heat in Georgia is frequently equal to that in Barbadoes, and to that under the line; yet I and my family, eight in number, employed all our spare time there, in felling of trees and clearing of ground—as hard labor as any slave need be employed in. The German family, likewise, forty in number,

were employed in all manner of labor. This was so far from impairing our health, that we all continued perfectly well, while the idle ones round about us were swept away as with a pestilence. It is not true, therefore, that white men are not able to labor, even in hot climates, full as well as black. If they were not, it would be better that none should labor there, that the work should be left undone, than that myriads of innocent men should be murdered, and myriads more be dragged into the basest slavery. 'But the furnishing us with slaves is necessary for the trade, wealth, and glory of the nation.' Better no trade, than trade procured by villainy. It is far better to have no wealth, than to gain wealth at the expense of virtue. Better is honest poverty, than all the riches bought by the tears, and sweat, and blood of our fellow creatures.

28. "When we have slaves, it is necessary to use them with severity. What, *to whip them for every petty offence, till they are in a gore of blood?* To take that opportunity of rubbing pepper and salt into their raw flesh? To drop burning sealing-wax upon their skins? To cut off half their foot with an axe? To hang them on gibbets, that they may die by inches with heat, and hunger, and thirst? To pin them down to the ground, and then burn them by degrees from the feet to the head? To roast them alive? When did a Turk or a heathen find it necessary to use a fellow creature thus? To what end is this usage necessary? 'To prevent their running away, and to keep them constantly to their labor, that they may not idle away their time. So miserably stupid is this race of men, so stubborn and so wicked!' Allowing this, to whom is that stupidity owing? It lies altogether at the door of their inhuman masters, who gave them no means, no opportunity of improving their understanding; and indeed leave them no motive, either from hope or fear, to attempt any such thing. They were no way remarkable for stupidity while they remained in Africa. To some of the inhabitants of Europe they are greatly superior. Survey the natives of Benin, and of Lapland. Compare the Samooids and the Angolans. The African is in no respect inferior to the European. Their stupidity in our colonies is not natural; otherwise than it is the natural effect of their condition. Consequently it is not *their* fault, but *yours*; and you must answer for it before God and man. 'But their stupidity is not the only reason of our treating them with severity: for it is hard to say which is the greatest, this, or their stubbornness and wickedness. But do not these, as well as the other, lie at *your* door? Are not stubbornness, cunning, pilfering and divers other vices the natural, necessary fruits of Slavery in every age and nation? What means have you used to remove this stubbornness? Have you tried what mildness and gentleness would do? What pains have you taken, what method have you used to reclaim them from their wickedness? Have you carefully taught them, 'that there is a God, a wise, powerful, merciful Being, the Creator and Governor of heaven and earth; that he has appointed a day wherein he will judge the world, will take an account of all our thoughts, words, and actions; that in that day he will reward every child of man according to his works: that then the righteous shall inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world; and the wicked shall be cast into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels?' If you have not done

this, if you have taken no pains nor thought about this matter, can you wonder at their wickedness? What wonder if they should cut your throat? and if they did, whom could you thank for it but yourself? You first *acted the villain in making them slaves*, whether you stole them or bought them. You kept them stupid and wicked, by cutting them off from all opportunities of improving either in knowledge or virtue; and now you assign their want of wisdom or goodness as the reason for using them worse than brute beasts!

WESLEY USED AS SEVERE LANGUAGE ON THIS SUBJECT AS ANY ABOLITIONISTS OF THE PRESENT DAY.

29. "I add a few words to those who are more immediately concerned.

"1. To *Traders*. You have torn away children from their parents, and parents from their children; husbands from their wives; wives from their beloved husbands; brethren and sisters from each other. You have dragged them who have never done you any wrong, in chains, and forced them into the vilest Slavery, never to end but with life; such Slavery as is not found among the Turks in Algiers, nor among the heathens in America. You induce the villain to steal, rob, murder men, women and children, without number, by paying him for his execrable labor. It is all your act and deed. Is your conscience quite reconciled to this? does it never reproach you at all? Has gold entirely blinded your eyes, and stupified your heart? Can you see, can you *feel* no harm therein? Is it doing as you would be done to? Make the case your own. 'Master,' said a slave at Liverpool, to the merchant that owned him, 'what if some of my countrymen were to come here, and take away Mistress, and Tommy, and Billy, and carry them into our country, and make them slaves; how would you like it?' His answer was worthy of a man—'I will never buy a slave more while I live.' Let his resolution be yours. Have no more any part in this detestable business.—Instantly leave it to those unfeeling wretches, 'who laugh at human nature and compassion.' Be you a man; not a wolf, a devourer of the human species! Be merciful, that you may obtain mercy.

"Is there a God? You know there is. Is he a just God? Then there must be a state of retribution; a state wherein the just God will reward every man according to his works. Then what reward will be rendered to *you*? O think betimes! before you drop into eternity! Think now. 'He shall have judgment without mercy that hath showed no mercy.' Are you a *man*? Then you should have a *human* heart. But have you indeed? what is your heart made of? Is there no such principle as compassion there? Do you never *feel* another's pain? Have you no sympathy? no sense of human wo? no pity for the miserable? When you saw the streaming eyes, the heaving breasts, the bleeding sides, and the tortured limbs of your fellow creatures, were you a stone or a brute? Did you look upon them with the eyes of a tiger? Had you no relenting? Did not one tear drop from your eye, one sigh escape from your breast? Do you feel no relenting *now*? If you do not, you must go on till the measure of your iniquities is full. Then will the great God deal with *you* as you have dealt with *them*, and require all their blood at your

hands. At that day it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah than for you. But if your heart does relent; resolve, God being your helper, to escape for your life. Regard not money! All that a man hath, will he give for his life. Whatever you lose, lose not your soul; nothing can countervail that loss. Immediately quit the horrid trade; at all events be an honest man.

WESLEY BELIEVED THAT ALL SLAVEHOLDERS WERE MORE OR LESS GUILTY.

30. "2. To *Slave-holders*. This equally concerns all slave-holders, of whatever rank and degree: seeing *men-buyers* are exactly on a level with *men-stealers*!—Indeed you say, 'I pay honestly for my goods; and I am not concerned to know how they are come by.' Nay, but you are: you are deeply concerned to know they are honestly come by: otherwise you are partaker with a thief, and are not a jot honester than he. But you know they are not honestly come by: you know they are procured by means *nothing near so innocent as picking pockets, house-breaking, or robbery upon the highway*. You know they are procured by a deliberate species of more complicated villainy, of fraud, robbery and murder, than was ever practised by *Mahomedans* or *Pagans*; in particular, by murders of all kinds; by the blood of the innocent poured upon the ground like water. Now it is *your* money that pays the African butcher. You, therefore, are principally guilty of all these frauds, robberies and murders. You are the spring that puts all the rest in motion. They would not stir a step without *you*: therefore the blood of all these wretches who die before their time, lies upon *your* head. 'The blood of thy brother crieth against thee from the earth.' O whatever it costs, put a stop to its cry before it be too late; instantly, at any price, were it the half of your goods, deliver thyself from blood-guiltiness! *Thy hands, thy bed, thy furniture, thy house and thy lands, at present are stained with blood*. Surely it is enough; accumulate no more guilt: spill no more the blood of the innocent. Do not hire another to shed blood; do not pay him for doing it. Whether you are a Christian or not, show yourself a man! Be not more savage than a lion or bear!"

31. "Perhaps you will say—'I do not buy any slaves; I only use those left by my father.' But is that enough to satisfy your conscience? Had your father, have *you*, has any man living, a right to use another as a slave? It cannot be, even setting revelation aside. Neither war nor contract can give any man such a property in another as he has in his sheep and oxen. Much less is it possible that any child of man should ever be born a slave. Liberty is the right of every human creature, as soon as he breathes the vital air; and no human law can deprive him of that right which he derives from the law of nature. If, therefore, you have any regard to justice, to say nothing of mercy, or of the revealed law of God, render unto all their due. Give liberty to whom liberty is due, to every child of man, to every partaker of human nature. Let none serve you but by his own act and deed, by his own voluntary choice.—Away with all whips, all chains, all compulsion! Be gentle toward all men, and see that you invariably do unto every one, as you would he should do unto you."

WESLEY DID ALL THAT HE COULD, BOTH BY PREACHING AND WRITING, TO SHOW THE SIN OF SLAVE-HOLDING.

32. The following, also, are important testimonies from this same great and good man, nor should any one of his followers be ashamed to read or circulate them among the slave-holding Methodists of this country, especially in these degenerate times:—

“That execrable sum of all villanies, commonly called the *slave-trade*. I read of nothing like it in the heathen world, whether ancient or modern, and it infinitely exceeds, in every instance of barbarity, whatever Christian slaves suffer in Mahomedan countries.” (Journal, under date of Feb. 12, 1772.) And yet in this very trade thousands of Christians at the present day are engaged!

Again in a letter to Mr. T. Funnell, dated November, 1787, he writes as follows:—

“Dear Brother—Whatever assistance I can give those generous men who join to oppose that execrable trade, I certainly shall give. I have printed a large edition of the ‘Thoughts on Slavery,’ and dispersed them to every part of England. But there will be vehement opposition made, both by slave-merchants and slave-holders; and they are mighty men: but our comfort is, He that dwelleth on high is mightier. Your affectionate brother,

“J. WESLEY.”

MR. WESLEY LEFT HIS DYING TESTIMONY AGAINST THE SIN OF SLAVE-HOLDING.

33. The following letter is exceedingly interesting inasmuch as it was the last but two which Mr. Wesley ever wrote, and it is dated only four days before his death. It was written to the great and good Mr. Wilberforce, the pioneer of the abolition cause in England:

“London, Feb. 26, 1791.

“Dear Sir—Unless the Divine power has raised you up as *Athanasius contra Mundum* [Athanasius against the world] I see not how you can go through your glorious enterprise, in opposing that execrable villany, which is the scandal of religion, of England, and of human nature. Unless God has raised you up for this very thing you will be worn out by the opposition of men and devils. But, ‘if God be for you, who can be against you?’ O, ‘be not weary in well doing!’ Go on in the name of God, and in the power of his might, till even American Slavery (the vilest that ever saw the sun) shall vanish away before it. Reading this morning a tract, written by a poor African, I was particularly struck by that circumstance,—that a man who has a black skin, being wronged or outraged by a white man, can have no redress; it being a law, in all our colonies, that the oath of a black against a white goes for nothing. What villany is this!

“Your affectionate servant,

“J. WESLEY.”

THE TESTIMONY OF DR. CLARKE AGAINST THE SLAVE-TRADE AND THE SIN OF SLAVE-HOLDING.

34. The following is another extract from Dr. Adam Clarke:—

“In heathen countries Slavery was in some sort excusable; among Christians it is an enormity and a crime for which perdition has scarcely an adequate state of punishment.”

And again he says:—

“I here register my testimony against the unprincipled, inhuman, anti-Christian, and diabolic *slave-trade*, with all its *authors*, *promoters*, *abettors* and *sacrilegious gains*; as well as against the great devil, the father of it and them.”

35. Now we put it to any man of candor to say, if any stronger language has ever been used by any abolitionist of the present day, in describing the sin of slave-holding, than the foregoing, which is used by two of the best men the world ever saw? And observe, too, that slave-holding in these extracts is put “exactly upon a level” with man-stealing and the traffic in human souls.

ALL SLAVE-HOLDERS DO THE SAME TO PERPETUATE THE SIN OF SLAVERY, WHICH TEMPERATE RUM DRINKERS DO TO PERPETUATE THE SIN OF DRUNKENNESS.

36. We do not suppose, however, that either of the above named writers designed to be understood as saying that there are no degrees in the guilt of slave-holding; nor do we wish to be understood as applying all the foregoing remarks to all enslavers *indiscriminately*; nor yet is it for us to search out the individuals, if there be any, to whom they may not be applied; but we do say, that every one who in any way countenances slave-holding, is justly chargeable, more or less, with the evils which flow from it. We say that *Christian enslavers* of the human species do the very same to perpetuate the system and evils of Slavery, which the *Christian rum drinker*, or the *Christian distiller* does to perpetuate the evils of intemperance; and it is remarkable, that *the temperate do generally refer to the good, the CHRISTIAN RUM DRINKERS, to justify themselves in their habits, in precisely the same way that we are frequently referred to many Christians, and Christian ministers, who HOLD THEIR SPECIES IN BONDAGE, as a SUFFICIENT JUSTIFICATION of the system of Slavery!!*

THE TESTIMONY OF THE WESLEYAN CONFERENCE IN ENGLAND ON THIS SUBJECT.

37. We beg leave also to commend the following testimony to your notice, and to bespeak for it a candid perusal. It is a document drawn up by the pious and able Richard Watson, and it was adopted unanimously by the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of preachers, in England, in 1830:—

“The Conference taking into consideration the laudable efforts which are now making to impress the public with a due sense of the injustice and inhumanity of *CONTINUING* that system of Slavery which exists in many of the colonies of the British crown, would embrace this opportunity to invite a general application to Parliament, by petition, that such measures may in its wisdom be adopted as shall speedily lead to the universal termination of the wrongs inflicted upon so large a portion of our fellow men,—

“Resolved as follows:—

“1. That as a body of Christian ministers, they feel themselves called upon again to record their solemn judgment, that the holding of human beings in a state of Slavery is in direct opposition to all the principles of natural right, and to the benign spirit of the religion of Christ.

“2. That the system of bondage existing in our West India colonies is marked with characters of peculiar severity and injustice; inasmuch as a great majority of the slaves are doomed to labors inhumanly wasting to health and life; and are exposed to arbitrary, excessive and degrading punishments, without any effectual protection from adequate and impartially administered laws.

“3. That the Conference, having long been engaged in endeavoring the instruction and evangelization of the Pagan Negroes of our West India Colonies by numerous and expensive missions, supported by the pious liberality of the friends of religion at home, have had a painful experience of the unfavorable influence of a state of Slavery upon the moral improvement of a class of men most entitled to the sympathy and help of all true Christians; that the patient and devoted men who have labored in the work of Negro Conversion, have too often been made the objects of obloquy and persecution, from that very contempt or fear of the negroes which a system of Slavery inspires; that the violent prejudices of caste founded upon the color of the skin, and matured by a state of Slavery, and inseparable from it, have opposed the most formidable obstacles to the employment of colored teachers and missionaries, who would otherwise have been called into useful employment, in considerable numbers, as qualified instructors of their fellows; that the general discouragement of slave marriages, and the frequent violent separation of those husbands and wives who have been united in matrimony by missionaries, have served greatly to encourage and perpetuate a grossness of manners which might otherwise have been corrected; that the nearly absolute control of vicious masters, or their agents, over those under their power, is, to a lamentable extent, used for the corrupting of the young and polluting of the most hallowed relations of life; that the refusal of the Lord’s day to the slave, as a day of rest and religious worship, besides fostering the habit of entire irreligion, limits, and in many cases renders nugatory, every attempt at efficient religious instruction:—all which circumstances more or less felt in each of the colonies, demonstrate the incapability of Slavery with a general diffusion of the influence of morals and religion, and its necessary association with general ignorance, vice and wickedness.

“4. That the preachers assembled in Conference, feel themselves the more bound to exhort the members of the Methodist societies and congregations at home, to unite with their fellow subjects in presenting their petitions to the next parliament to take this important subject into its earliest consideration, because of the interesting relation which exists between them and the numerous Methodist societies in the West Indies, in which are no fewer than twenty-four thousand slaves, who, with their families, have been brought under the influence of Christianity, and who, in so many instances, have fully rewarded the charitable toil of those who have applied themselves to promote their spiritual benefit, and whose right to exemption from a state of Slavery is, if possible, strengthened by their being partakers of ‘like precious faith,’ and from their standing in the special relation of *brethren*, to all who themselves profess to be Christians.

THE VENERABLE BODY OF WESLEYAN MINISTERS, NOT ONLY CONDEMN THE SIN OF SLAVE-HOLDING, BUT THEY EXPRESS THEIR ABHORRENCE OF THOSE PRINCIPLES UPON WHICH MANY ATTEMPT TO JUSTIFY IT.

“5. That the Conference fully concur in those strong moral views of the evil of Slavery, which are taken by their fellow Christians of different denominations, and in the purpose which is so generally entertained of presenting petitions to parliament, from their respective congregations, for its speedy and universal abolition ; and earnestly recommend it to all the congregations of the Wesleyan Methodist societies throughout Great Britain and Ireland, to express in this manner, their sympathy with an injured portion of their race, and their ABHORRENCE of all those principles on which it is attempted to defend the subjection of human beings to hopeless and interminable Slavery.

THE WESLEYAN MINISTERS ENCOURAGED THEIR PEOPLE TO ADOPT ALL SUITABLE MEASURES FOR THE REMOVAL OF SLAVERY FROM THE NATION.

“6. That the Conference still further recommend in the strongest manner, to such of the members of the Methodist societies as enjoy the elective franchise, that, in this great crisis, when the question is, whether justice and humanity shall triumph over oppression and cruelty, or nearly a million of our fellow-men, many of whom are also our fellow Christians, shall remain excluded from the rights of humanity and the privileges of that constitution under which they were born ; they will use that solemn trust to promote the rescue of our country from the guilt and dishonor which have been brought upon it, by a criminal connivance at the oppressions which have so long existed in its colonies ; and that, in the elections now on the eve of taking place, they will give their influence and votes only to those candidates who pledge themselves to support, in parliament, the most effectual measures for the entire abolition of Slavery throughout the British empire.” (See Watson's Life, page 375.)

38. Such, dear Brethren, are the views entertained by the venerable body of Wesleyan Methodist preachers in England, on this momentous question ; and we candidly confess, that we cannot suppress our shame and extreme mortification, when we compare the principles of Wesley and the doings of this able body, with the present state of feeling in the church in this country on this most interesting subject.—Here, one death-like silence reigns, with but a few exceptions, throughout the entire ranks of our six thousand travelling and local preachers ; no one of our twenty Conferences has lifted a finger, or uttered one word of pity for more than two millions of our brethren, who are now, as they have been for years, suffering a state of bondage worse and more cruel than any which ever disgraced the West India colonies. No voice of prayer goes up to Heaven for them in our prayer meetings or monthly concerts ; for them the pulpit utters no notes of sympathy ; but few of our widely circulated papers are suffered to utter a word for the degraded millions of American slaves who are perishing for lack of knowledge ; nay, if any one attempts to speak for them, by our principal periodical, they are denounced

as "enemies to the slaves"—"enemies to the country," and as "injurious, anti-republican, speculative, hot-headed, furious and frenzied abolitionists."*

THE WESLEYAN METHODIST SOCIETIES RESPONDED TO THE VOICE OF THE CONFERENCE UPON THIS SUBJECT.

39. It is truly gratifying to find, according to a recent number of the Wesleyan Methodist Magazine, that the societies throughout that nation were not backward in engaging in the good work according to the request of the Conference; and the petitions which the Methodists alone forwarded to Parliament, the Magazine informs us, contained no less than *two hundred and twenty-nine thousand four hundred and twenty-six names*, a larger number, considerably, than was forwarded by any other one denomination in the empire!

As might have been expected, the enslavers in the West Indies, and their abettors in Great Britain, stirred themselves in earnest to oppose the measures which were taken by Christians and Christian ministers throughout the nation to bring about the abolition of Slavery; they raved and strove against them in various ways; they called it a "political question," and one about which those in England knew little or nothing; they denied them the right of meddling with it, and denounced them for "interfering" in the affairs of the distant colonies. But those measures prevailed, as "anti-republican, jacobinical and hot-headed," as those might have been thought to be who used them; and now the whole world knows, that the liberation of eight hundred thousand slaves in the West Indies, was effected by the influence of *Christian* efforts which were made on the distant island of Great Britain. And it is an interesting fact, that the time arrived for them to be set free, while the Wesleyan Conference, which had labored and prayed so sincerely for this event, was in session. This was August 1, 1834.

In their annual address to the Methodist societies they thus allude to this memorable event:—

40. "It is a singular and very delightful circumstance, that, during the sittings of the Conference, the day arrived when the state of Slavery in the British West India Colonies, according to the decision of the Legislature, should forever cease. We congratulate you on this happy accomplishment of your desires. The bondage of the negroes has now become a matter of past history, and no longer oppresses or demoralizes the master. We deeply regret the fact, that there are yet states professedly Christian, in which the sinfully degrading *caste* of color exists in its most repulsive form; but we are willing to cherish the hope, that the example of Great Britain will be followed by every other nation, and that Slavery, at least among all people calling themselves Christian, will be allowed to continue no longer. 'God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell upon the face of the earth; and we anticipate the time, by the admission and triumph of this great

* See Chris. Ad. and Jour. of June 20, 1834 The remarks which relate to this paper are omitted, here, because it has since disclaimed ever having had any *design* of saying any thing as an attempt to justify slaveholding.

truth, when all civil distinctions arising merely from color and complexion shall be abolished."

But whether any of those generous-hearted and truly Christian ministers will ever live to realize the pleasing anticipations which they here express, concerning the *Christian* states of which they speak, is extremely problematical; and what they would have said, had they fully known the real state of things with regard to Slavery in the Church which bears their name in this country, it is not easy to conceive. One expression of their feelings they have given, however, we believe, from what little they did know a few years since; they have sent no one to represent them in this country, since the General Conference of 1828.

THE SOLEMN DUTIES WHICH A KNOWLEDGE OF THESE THINGS IMPOSES UPON US.

Now, in view of these appalling facts, you will naturally be led to inquire,—“What can we do?” To this inquiry we beg leave respectfully to answer, and to suggest a few things which we humbly conceive every Christian, and especially every Christian minister, is at this time more than ever deeply concerned to do.

41. 1. We should make ourselves well acquainted with the state of Slavery in this country, especially as it is connected with the Christian Church. This subject is at the present time engrossing the attention of a great proportion of this nation; and by many, evils of the greatest magnitude are anticipated merely from the free discussion of the Slavery question, and for this reason, if for no other, we should inform ourselves upon this subject. Now we might as well try to hide the light of the noonday sun as to prevent its discussion; and as to the evils feared by many, we conceive that they are already upon us—they have for years been palsyng the energies of the nation, and eating out the vitals of the Christian Church. These evils have come upon us while we have been sleeping and dreaming of peace and prosperity; and so we have been resting unconscious of any danger, till the horrid monster has insinuated himself into the church of God, and blighted her fairest prospects with his pestiferous breath.—And how can we be faithful to our solemn trust, without informing ourselves upon this momentous subject?

2. There is another thing which God himself commands us to do:—*Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; them which suffer adversity, as being yourselves also in the body.* Heb. xiii. 3. Two millions five hundred thousand of our fellow citizens or brethren are “in bonds,” even in this land of boasted freedom. Do we remember them at the family altar? Do we remember them at the monthly concert for prayer? Do we remember that the great proportion of them are in their sins, going down to hell; that it is the grand policy of most of their masters to degrade and brutalize their minds, by withholding from them all knowledge; and consequently, if there be any one class of human beings upon the face of the globe who have a higher claim than all the rest for our sympathies and missionary labors, the two million five hundred thousand slaves in our own land are that class? And we should remember, too, that these miserable beings are increasing at the rate

of from sixty to seventy thousand every year, or about two hundred are added to the number every day!

3. "But when should the system of Slavery cease?" We answer, if, as we trust it has been fully made to appear in the foregoing remarks, Slavery is one general system of violence, robbery, injustice, vice and oppression, then it is a sin in the sight of Heaven, and ought to cease at once, now and **FOREVER**. But mark us here. We do not mean by this that all the slaves should be thrust out loose upon the nation like a herd of cattle, nor that they should be immediately invested with all political privileges and rights, nor yet that they should be banished from the land of their nativity to a distant clime. But we mean that the slaves should IMMEDIATELY be brought under the PROTECTION of suitable LAWS, placing them under such a supervision as might be adapted to their condition; one which would secure to them, by adequate and impartially administered laws, the right of enjoying the fruits of their own labor, and the privilege of obtaining secular and religious instruction. And nothing in the world hinders the enactment of such laws, by which the slaves might be made free with all imaginable safety immediately, but the *wickedness* of those who hold them in bondage.

We would, dear brethren, in conclusion, commend this subject in all its important bearings, to your most serious and prayerful attention; and in doing this, as we cannot enlarge upon it here, we would mention the Letters of J. G. Birney, Esq., which have recently been published on the subject of African Colonization and Slavery; and for all the Anti-Slavery publications, we would respectfully bespeak a candid reading before you pass any judgment against them.

We leave it to your own consciences and the providence of God, to dictate to you the course of your duty. But we would respectfully suggest whether the true friends of Methodism and the church of Christ, will have done their duty, if the next General Conference is suffered to pass without having heard from our congregations and conferences upon this momentous subject. Why should we be so very far behind our brethren in England, in relation to this thing? Why should we be at all behind any of the good and the faithful in this country, in our efforts to relieve the Church of so "great" an "evil?"—How can we stand still and pause, when God and the cause of bleeding humanity have claims so high!

Permit us to subscribe ourselves, dear brethren, with due respect and sincere affection,

SHIPLEY W. WILLSON,
ABRAM D. MERRILL,
LA ROY SUNDERLAND,
GEORGE STORRS,
JARED PERKINS.

Boston, Dec. 19, 1834.

DEFENCE OF THE "APPEAL."

CHRISTIAN FRIENDS AND BRETHREN:—

The publication of a paper, called "A Counter Appeal," which has been widely circulated throughout the New England States, and elsewhere, makes it our duty to lay before you the document upon which the remarks contained in that paper, are said to have been founded. We have before informed you, in the 289th No. of Zion's Herald, that the document against which this "Counter Appeal" has been published, was not originally designed for the public generally, but only for the preachers who were members of the same Conferences with ourselves. But now, as a few of our brethren whom we addressed in our Appeal, have felt it their duty to publish their protest against it, charging it with being "fraught with doctrines radically erroneous," and which "must produce consequences deeply injurious" to the cause of God, we cannot see how we can, in justice to you and to the cause of truth, withhold the document upon which such remarks have been made, and accordingly we have presented it on the preceding pages for your candid and prayerful consideration.

We would now, dear Brethren, respectfully request of you a patient and impartial investigation, both of our "Appeal," and the "Counter" one which our brethren have sent out against it. We do most earnestly desire that the length of these two documents, may not prevent any one into whose hands they may fall, from reading every part of them. We entreat you as you love the cause of truth and humanity, as you venerate the memory of Wesley, and as you love the Church of your choice, that you will give the Appeal on the preceding pages, a thorough reading, and that you will not neglect any thing which is said in the "Counter Appeal" against it. And now, also, that you will possess your souls in patience while we proceed to test the course of reasoning which has been pursued in the "Counter Appeal," on the subject of Slavery, and its connection with the Church of God.

In the examination of a few sentiments put forth in this "Counter Appeal," we earnestly hope, that nothing which you may find in our remarks, may be interpreted into a want of respect, or love for those whose names you have seen attached to that paper; we differ from them it is true, in our views of *slaveholding*, but even this difference of opinion, we trust, will turn to our mutual benefit; for they will certainly love us and pray for us the more, if they think us in an error; and the more they strive to reclaim us, under such a supposition, the more we, on our part, shall, by the grace of God, love and pray for them. Nor can we believe that the discussion of this question will be attended with any evil consequences to the Church of which we are members, or to the poor slaves, whom the great God has commanded us to *remember*, and whose cause he has made it our duty to *plead*. TRUTH is our object, and

if we search for this treasure, in the use of the best means in our power, may we not prayerfully and reasonably hope, that the God of Truth will enlighten our minds and give us his blessing?

It is certainly very desirable, in the examination of the subject upon which we differ from our respected brethren, that our remarks should be divested, as far as possible, from every thing which does not directly relate to the question under consideration; and as we now furnish you with our "Appeal," which you will read for yourselves, we shall leave it for you to judge whether it was correct, and in time, for our brethren to say as they do in the very first sentence of their paper, that we had "*made an ATTEMPT to DISTURB the harmony and prosperity of our Church;*" and you must judge, also, whether our "Appeal" was sent out, in a "tone of feeling *forgetful* of its own purposes, in the *excitement* of the moment," and whether there was "*a discrepancy* between the measures" we used, and "*the end*" at which we "aimed, which presents a contrast nearly *ludicrous*."

We proceed to state

THE QUESTION AT ISSUE.

The question upon which we join issue with our brethren, is nothing more or less than this;—*Is it a sin against God to hold property in the human species?* This is the question. And here we might inquire of our brethren, why they did not state this question, *distinctly*, when they entered their protest against us? Why do they take one of the conclusions which we anticipated from our views of this question, and bring it forward in their remarks, "as the most concise and explicit expression" of the point at issue? Let the reader turn to the place in the Appeal, numbered 1, and he will find our views of this question stated, in no very equivocal language, we believe, and where we say, "*No man has, or can have a right to hold a fellow man for one moment in bondage as a piece of merchantable PROPERTY;*" and that "*every American citizen who RETAINS a fellow being in bondage, as a piece of PROPERTY, and takes the price of his labor without his consent, is guilty of a CRIME which cannot be reconciled with the spirit of the Christian religion.*" We may find what Slavery is, by a reference to the laws of the slave States:—"A slave is one who is in the power of his master, to whom he belongs. The master may *sell* him, *dispose of his person, his industry, his labor*; he can *do nothing, possess nothing*, nor acquire any thing but which must belong to his master."—*Louisiana Code, Art. 3.*

"Slaves shall be deemed, taken, reputed and adjudged to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their masters and possessors, to all intents and purposes whatsoever."—*Laws of S. Carolina.*

Now it must be observed, here, that the question at issue between us is, not about the *evils* of Slavery,—not whether one man may not have a right to the labor of another, under certain circumstances, nor whether a man may not be deprived of his liberty who has committed a crime; nor yet again, whether a government may not have a right, under certain circumstances, to the services of its subjects; but the question is, *Has one human being a right to hold property in the person of another human being?* *Can man hold property in man, consistently with the spirit of the Christian religion?* We say, No! But our brethren take the affirmative of this question, and joining issue with us, answer Yes!

In noticing what our brethren are pleased to call the "Scripture

argument," in relation to slaveholding, we regret to find that they have stumbled upon the very threshold of the subject. After quoting a part of two passages of Scripture, they come to the following conclusion:—

"No man has a right to remove any providential evil upon himself, by imposing a still greater evil upon another."

And by this very *simple* rule, they prove that it must be right for one man to hold another in bondage as his *property*! It did not once occur to them, it seems, that such a statement of theirs would go for nothing, just nothing at all, when applied to the question at issue, till they had first proved that it is not a *sin* to hold property in man. But they proceed to say, "WHATEVER be the nature of any *evil*, IMPOSED by PROVIDENCE upon us, loss of health, of liberty, or of life; if we love our neighbors as ourselves, we shall continue that endurance, rather than relieve ourselves by the infliction of still greater misery upon another." We readily confess, that we should have some very serious objection to this statement, even were it not a most palpable instance of *begging the question* at issue. But it takes for granted, that which our brethren must have known it belonged to them to prove, before they founded a course of reasoning upon it. They should have proved, 1. That when one man steals the liberty of another, it is no sin against God, in him who takes away, or withholds his neighbor's liberty. 2. That when an innocent man loses his liberty, in this way, it is an *evil* which is brought upon him by the providence, or the *direct agency* of God. And 3. That if every slaveholder in this nation were to cease holding property in his species, it would be attended with a greater amount of evil, than what is now produced by the slave system. But have they proved either of these particulars? Have they even attempted it? And yet, they reason upon it, state cases, and draw inferences, just as though it were a matter perfectly plain and already *demonstrated*! Nor is this the only singular fact which the reader must have observed in relation to this "Scripture argument;"—they are talking through the whole of it, about the duty of the *slave*, whereas the document against which they say they are entering their "protest," was designed to show the *sin of slaveholding*, and the duty of the *master* to let the oppressed go free!!

So these brethren "generalize" their "Scripture argument" thus:—"If any class of men," say they, "by any *dispensation* of God, by birth, or otherwise, be placed in any circumstances of unhappiness of *whatever kind*, they are bound by the authority of the Golden Rule, to continue that state of unhappiness, so long as it can be removed only by imposing a still greater amount of unhappiness upon society at large;" and statements of a similar kind follow in their train through one whole column of this "Counter Appeal." But without stopping to show how very inconclusive all such statements are, when applied to the point now under consideration, we will simply propose a question or two, and leave this part of the "Scripture argument," for the present, to the consideration of the reader. And

1. We would ask, who is to be the judge, as to the amount of misery which might be brought upon another, when one endeavors to rid himself of Slavery; the one who suffers the loss of his liberty, or he who withholds it from him? Or is a third person to be the judge, who looks on and sees the injury which is inflicted upon his neighbor? If you say that the sufferers should not be the

judges in the case, then it follows that the Poles, the Greeks, and the "patriots of our own revolution," sinned against God, in judging for themselves and acting accordingly; if you admit, as it seems these brethren do, in their *illustration* of the argument, that the sufferer's should be the judges in the case, then it follows that all the slaves in this nation, might rise and butcher their masters to-day, provided they thought such a deed would be a "*less evil*" than the one which they are suffering.

But if you say that the masters *must* be the judges in the case, then it follows that when another man is the cause of your "losing your property, your health, your liberty or life," he must be the *only judge* in the case, whether he has done wrong or not. Or, lastly, if you say that a third person must be the judge, that is, one who neither inflicts or suffers the evil, then it follows, that the efforts of the abolitionists of the present day, are justifiable in the sight of God, for they act upon this very conviction, that the immediate abolition of slaveholding, (that is, holding property in the human species,) would be a much less evil, than the continuance of the slave system.

2. But we would inquire, in the next place, how long it is since our brethren, who have signed the "Counter Appeal," embraced the notion, that "*whatever be the nature of any evil*," which any part of the human family suffer, it is "*IMPOSED UPON THEM*" by the agency of God? We have been in the way of believing, that "No evil can from God proceed," and the Discipline of our Church declares Slavery to be a "*great evil*," and we understand the Discipline to mean by this, that Slavery is a *great moral evil*; but this "Counter Appeal" give us a new idea upon the subject; it was "*IMPOSED*" upon us *by the PROVIDENCE OF GOD*;"—it came upon the nation by the "*DISPENSATION OF GOD!*" This is a "*new divinity*" for Methodist ministers to preach, and we hope for the honor of *WESLEY*, that it did not originate at the seat of learning in a neighboring State, which bears his venerable name.

Our brethren seem to complain of us, for saying "that *no part* of the *system of Slavery*, is *just* or *humane*," and also for not bringing forward more passages from the Bible, in support of our views. But we, on our part, think we have much more reason to complain of them, for not noticing the arguments which we built upon those texts which we did introduce into our Appeal. Our object in that paper was not, as we distinctly stated, (see 1, in the Appeal) to "attempt a particular discussion of the principles of Slavery," nor to enter into a labored examination of the Scriptures on the subject; but it was to exhibit the views of Wesley, Clarke, Watson, and the British Conference, on the subject of slaveholding, and to show that the Discipline of our Church is opposed to it. And "here we are left to ask," why our brethren did not notice the arguments that we built upon the Scriptures which we did quote? Why did they not bring those "*under their critical canvassing*," which the reader will have seen in our Appeal, numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 11? Why do they pass them all over, without even attempting to confute them? "Why was this examination" of our arguments "commenced, or why was it not in some measure completed?" Especially, why did they not notice the arguments of Wesley, numbered 25, and the reasoning of Judge Blackstone, by which they prove that "*all slaveholding is inconsistent with any degree of natural justice?*" Why did they pass over the arguments of Wesley, (26) which show "*slaveholding to be utterly inconsistent with mercy?*"

Was "their random sermonizing upon a few comparative indecisive texts, intended to be passed upon the unscrutinizing reader, for a sifting of the Bible doctrines," and for a successful confutation of arguments which we used in our Appeal, but which they do not even honor with a passing notice, or mention in any way? If the reader will be at the pains to look at those passages in the Appeal numbered 30 and 31, he will find some language from Wesley, which our brethren could not have misunderstood, and if he has read the "Counter Appeal," he may conjecture why those arguments are passed over by our brethren in total silence.

And here we might conclude our review of what is called the "Scripture argument," in the protest of our brethren, for reasons which have been already stated; for, as the arguments which we brought forward in our Appeal remain untouched, we might with the utmost propriety wait until those are answered, before we adduce more; but we will not dismiss the subject, or pass it over in such "honest despair," as it seems those have done, who have felt it their duty to protest against our Appeal.

When the authors of the "Counter Appeal" complained of us for saying that "No part of the system of slaveholding is just or humane," they should have told us what part of the system they think is so; but as they have not given us any definite view of the system, it may now be proper for us to bring out a few of its features here, and then we shall be the better prepared to judge with how much force and propriety the additional arguments, which we are about to bring forward, bear upon the question at issue.

THE SLAVE SYSTEM.

1. *The system of American Slavery regards a certain class of the human species, as mere goods or chattels, "TO ALL INTENTS, CONSTRUCTIONS, AND PURPOSES WHATSOEVER."*

2. *It does not allow to the slave the rights of his own reason and conscience.*

3. *It annihilates the family state; prevents the parents from obeying the command of God with regard to their children;—it prohibits, or nullifies, the marriage rites, and prevents husbands and wives from obeying the commands of God with regard to each other.*

4. *It enjoins, or sanctions, promiscuous intercourse between the sexes, without the rites of marriage.*

5. *It holds all the religious privileges of the slave at the mere mercy of his master, whether that master be infidel, papist, or protestant.*

6. *It prevents the slave from obeying that command of God, which makes it the duty of all men to "Search the Scriptures."*

7. *Its direct tendency is to crush the mind of God's intelligent creatures, by forbidding, and preventing, all schools for "mental instruction."*

8. *It withholds the hire of the laborer.*

9. *It sanctions and covers the breach of the 8th commandment. It justifies the very same thing which our laws and the laws of nations punish as piracy, if committed on the coast of Africa, or on the high seas. It originates and justifies what the Bible calls "Manstealing."*

10. *It denies to the slave that protection for his character, his health and life, which is enjoyed by the white man.*

Here it must be observed, that what we have stated above, forms no part of what is generally called the "evils of slavery,"

or, in other words, the “*abuses* of the system;” but the above facts make up the very *system itself*, the very thing which we say is a *sin* against God, and against which our Appeal was designed to bear; and to prove that the above statements are correct, and not over-drawn in the least degree, we refer you to the laws of the Slave-states.*

It may be necessary here to correct an error into which our brethren have fallen, in supposing that we admit the sense which they give to the Greek word *δοῦλος*, rendered *servant* in our common version of the Bible; and hence they quote from Dr. Clarke, to prove, that “the word *δοῦλος*, which we translate *servant*, properly means, a *slave*; one who is the *entire property* of his master.” But why did they not quote the whole of Dr. Clarke’s definition of this word? Here it is; we will quote it for them:—

“Though *δοῦλος* frequently signifies a *slave* or *bondman*, yet it often implies a *servant* in general; or any one bound to another, either for a limited time, or for life.”—*Note on Eph. vi. 5.*†

The reader will here see, at once, the probable reason which kept the other part of Dr. Clarke’s definition of this word from the “Counter Appeal;” for had our brethren given this to their readers, it would have utterly nullified and totally set aside the whole of their “critical canvassing” on every passage of scripture which they have quoted on the question at issue!! And we can hardly suppress our astonishment, that it did not once occur to them, while deliberating upon the subject, or while writing five columns of “scripture arguments,” or at least when reading over the “Counter Appeal,” as many times as it is reasonable to suppose they must have done, before putting their names to it, that not one of those passages of scripture, which they have quoted,

* “*Stroud’s Sketches of the Slave-laws*,” a work that ought to be read by every Christian in the land.

† And we find this view of the subject very much confirmed, by a very ably written article in the No. of the Bib. Repository for Jan. 1835, from the pen of Mr. B. B. Edwards, on “*Slavery in Ancient Greece*.” Mr Edwards, it is well known, is one of the most classical writers in this country, and, in giving an account of slavery in Athens, as it is incidentally delineated by Deinosthenes, he says:—“Slaves, as long as they were under the government of a master, were called *δικτατοί*, but *after their FREEDOM was granted them*, they were named *δοῦλοι*, not being like the former, *a part of their master’s estate*, but only required to render some small service, such as was required of the *μέτοικοι* [resident strangers, or aliens] to whom, in some respects, they were inferior.”—*Vide Pot. Gr. An. vol. i. p. 68*—and *Watson’s Expos. on Rom. i. 1.*

Now, when we consider that the Attic Greek is substantially the language in which the New Testament was written, and that with but one exception, we believe, the apostles uniformly used the word *δοῦλος*, when speaking of the reciprocal duties of servants and their masters, it follows, if Potter and Mr. Edwards are correct, that the “specific directions” of the New Testament do not refer to a “relation” between a “master” and his “chattels,” or those whom he owned as a part of his estate, but to such a relation as does, and may properly enough, exist between servants and their masters, where the former are not held as the “entire property” of the latter; and yet, even if these directions did refer to such a relation between a master and his “chattels,” they must inevitably have been understood as virtually *condemning* that relation, because they do forbid the things which this relation “sanctioned,” allowed, and “enjoined upon the master,” who held it.

could be brought to bear upon the point at issue, till they had first proved that the *“servants,”* of whom the apostles speak, were held as the absolute property of their masters.

The reader will recollect the case of the servant, or slave, mentioned in Matt. xviii. 23, who was so much in his master's debt, that he was commanded to be sold and payment to be made; nor need he be told how utterly impossible it would be for a servant who is the absolute property of his master, to get in debt to his owner; this case, and others which might be named, prove the correctness of the definition above given of *δουλος*, that it often, if not always, when used in the New Testament, signifies “a servant in general, or one bound for a limited time,” to the service of another. Such a “relation” we believe is not sinful; and hence, if all slave-holding were to cease this moment throughout the world, there would still be the same need of the directions both to “masters” and “servants,” which we find in the New Testament, and many other parts of the Bible.

We have stated in our Appeal, (see 8,) “that Christianity does not alter the civil connection which one man may sustain to another, merely by his embracing it.” On this statement our brethren remark as follows:—“The writer in this simple sentence concedes the whole question,” and even “more than we can accept.” Perhaps not; let us see.

Does Christianity ALTER the civil connection which one man may sustain to another, *merely* by his embracing it? Christianity may condemn that relation, it is true; but does the act of his embracing religion, disannul that relation, and destroy it in view of the civil law? We think not. If our brethren can prove that it does, let them do so; let them state one case in point, and when they shall have done this, we will leave it to our readers to say who concedes the question at issue;—as for ourselves, we are not quite ready to concede it yet, and with the reader's patience, we will proceed to assign some of our reasons.

We observe then,

I. *That no authority can be drawn from the Old Testament, in favor of American slavery.* This will readily appear, if we consider the following facts.

1. The Hebrews held some in slavery for a limited period, by the special *permission* and direction of God; and this permission was given on the very same ground, that a Hebrew was permitted to kill a man who had murdered his friend, (Num. xxxv. 19;) and he might do this without the process of a trial. And upon the same ground, the Jews were permitted to commence and carry on exterminating wars against the idolatrous nations around them.—Hence we suppose, that it is as really wrong for any man in this age of the world, to take away the liberty of his innocent neighbor, or to withhold it from him in any way, without an express permission from God, as it would be for one to kill the murderer of his friend now, without the forms of law. And so also, it would be just as right for this nation to commence a war of *extermination* against all the heathen on the American continent, as it is for the nation to tolerate the domestic slave-trade, or for any man in the nation to hold property in his species. Before one human being can justly hold another as his property, he must have the permission of Him who has said, “all souls are mine.”

2. Two-thirds of all the servants in Israel were free at the end

of six years; and the fiftieth year all were set free. There was no such thing as hereditary servitude among the Jews.

But American slavery is perpetual, to the very last moment of the slave's earthly existence, and by law it is entailed upon all of his descendants to the latest posterity.

3. Jewish servitude was voluntary, except in those cases where it was the penalty annexed to crime.

But American slavery is involuntary. No one who is now a slave in this land, was ever consulted, before his liberty was taken away, whether he would be a slave or not; and if he had been, he could not have given his master a just and proper title to his body as his property. (See 25 in the Appeal.)

4. Under the Mosaic economy, servants might contend with their masters about their rights; and to despise the cause of such, was considered a heinous crime. (See Job xxxi. 13.)

But here, in this land of Christians, slaves can make no contracts of any kind, they can have no legal right to any property; all they have and are, belong to their masters.

5. The laws of Moses granted freedom to a servant who had been cruelly treated. (See Ex. xxii. 26, 27.)

But our Christian laws allow the master to punish his slave, as much as he desires, and afford the slave no redress; nay, if the slave makes any resistance, the laws expressly justify the master in *putting him to death*. In Kentucky, "any negro, mulatto, or Indian, bond or free," who "shall at any time" even "*lift his hand* in opposition to *ANY white person*, shall receive *THIRTY LASHES* on his or her *bare back, WELL LAID ON*, by order of the justice." (How we wish our brethren, who have signed the "Counter Appeal," had informed us what "part of the system" of American slavery, they consider "*just and humane*."}

6. Servants were carefully protected among the Jews, in their domestic relations; so that husbands and wives, parents and their children must not be separated. And in case the mother did not get her freedom as soon as her husband, the children remained with her; and her master was bound to receive him to service again, in case he chose to live with his wife and children.

But how is it in this land? Here, slaves are entirely unprotected in their social and domestic relations;—husbands and wives, parents and their children may be, and they are separated and parted forever, at the irresponsible will of the master.

7. The laws of Moses secured to servants, the necessary means of instruction and consolation.

But no such laws exist in this land; here the operation of the laws, tends directly to deprive the slaves of all "mental" and religious "instruction," for their whole power is exerted to keep slaves in the lowest kind of ignorance.

8. The laws of Moses require every one to pity and love the stranger who might chance to come among the Jews, and under severe penalties they were forbidden to vex or oppress him, in any way.

But how is it here, in this land of *freedom, and light, and Sabbaths, and Bibles, and Christians?* Here the laws view every colored stranger as an enemy, and they consider him a slave, until he proves his freedom.

9. If a servant escaped from his master and fled to the land of Israel, the law of Moses commanded every one to protect him; and forbade any one to deliver such to his master again.

But here, if a slave escape from his master, and flee to any part of the United States, the law forbids any one to protect him, and commands that he be delivered up to his master.

10. The Mosaic law forbade man-stealing as the highest kind of theft, and condemned the perpetrator to suffer death as the penalty.

But here, thousands of legally free people of color have been stolen, and sold into hopeless and involuntary servitude, as many are now every year, in this nation ; and there is no law by which they can redress their wrongs.

Such, Christian reader, are some of the wide discrepancies, which may be noted between the servitude which was tolerated in the dark ages of the Mosaic economy, and the *system of SLAVERY* which is established by law in this land, and which is supported also by Christians and Christian ministers, and defended by the *Christian Scriptures* !! But we remark,

11. *That no authority can be drawn from any part of the New Testament, in favor of this system.* We have already, we think, shown, that the reasoning of our brethren, in both parts of what they call their "Scripture Argument," upon this question, is inconclusive ; because in both cases, that is, in arguing from "the general spirit and tenor of the gospel," and from "the specific texts of the New Testament," they beg the question at issue.

But we have not yet done with this "Scripture argument;" as we are not quite ready to grant either of the various points for which our brethren beg so feinely in this "Counter Appeal;" we have a few more reasons to offer against it ;—let the reader weigh them.

1. Admitting, as our brethren attempt to prove in their argument, that the Apostles did mean to justify the "*relation*" which existed between master and slave, when that "*relation*" gave the master the body of the slave as his *absolute property*, then it follows as an undeniable consequence, that the holy apostles did mean to justify all the "*rights*" to which this "*relation*" entitled the master. If they justified such a "*relation*," they justified and approved *all the parts* of which it was composed. Let us mention one or two of them, and see how they will look when compared with the teaching of Christ and his apostles :—

(1.) Masters could put their slaves to death at their pleasure, and this they did do frequently, and with great cruelty. (2.) If a master was slain at his own house, and the murderer could not be found, all his domestic slaves were liable to be put to death ; and by the right of this "*relation*," four hundred were put to death on one single occasion. It will not do for our brethren to tell us, that in these cases there was an *abuse* of that "*relation*," which they would have us believe the apostles justified ; we say there was *no abuse* of that "*relation*;" when a slave among the Romans was put to death by his master, this act was a legitimate exercise of the "*right*" which the relation conferred upon him to whom the slave belonged.

2. It does not obviate the above argument when our brethren tell us, that the apostles by their commands to "believing masters," disannulled their right to perpetrate such cruelties as we have mentioned above; indeed, this fact every way confirms our argument ; for if the apostle did, as we all admit, forbid the exercise of those rights by which they might inflict such cruelties, then he did as certainly condemn the "*relation*" from which those rights were derived ; and we can see no way in which our

brethren can fairly escape from this conclusion, unless they admit that the apostles did condemn the *fruit*, but not the *tree* which produced it.

We know that it may be objected here, that if the apostle's command to "masters," did virtually *condemn* the "relation" of which we have been speaking, then the same directions would condemn any kind of relation which might have existed between "servants and their masters." But this objection amounts to nothing, as the reader will see at once, when he considers, that no other "relation" except the one for which our brethren contend, gave the master absolute power over his servant, and consequently no other "relation" gave him a "right" to do the things which are forbidden by the apostles.

3. There are one or two statements made by our brethren, with regard to the *character* of this "relation," when sustained by different persons, which we think deserve a passing notice. They charge us with "fallacy in arguing the morality of this question," because they say "we found" our reasonings "not upon the *relation* itself, nor upon what that *relation* would be in the hands of a truly Christian master, but upon extreme cases of licentious and cruel abuse of that *relation* in the hands of a tyrant." And again they say, that the apostle "exhibits the difference between slaveholding in the hands of a Christian master, and a tyrannical and heathen master." Does he? Indeed! Then a *Christian* may do that for which the apostle would condemn a *heathen*! But our brethren will say, probably, that this was not their meaning; they only meant that the *heathen* would be more likely to "abuse the *relation*;" the *Christian* would "actually perform the proper duties of his station." Granted; and if the *Christian* does exercise the "duties of his station," we think he will certainly "let the oppressed go free;" at least he will cease to hold them as his property; and if the *heathen* should "be guilty of all the cruelties and abominations of which Greek and Roman slavery was pre-eminently full," he would not *abuse* the "relation" for which these brethren contend, but he would do these things in the lawful exercise of those very rights, which this "relation" conferred upon him! If there be "fallacy" in this conclusion, let our brethren have the goodness to detect it; till they do this, however, the reader must be the judge as to where the "fallacy" lies.

4. But we have before assigned a number of arguments, (see 6 and 9, in the Appeal,) which we think are perfectly conclusive, why neither Christ or his apostles ever specified the "relation" now under consideration, and denounced it expressly as a *sin* against God; and which, we think, our brethren should not have passed over, in silence.

It is true, there is no express precept in the Bible in relation to many habits which prevail at this age among men; but these habits, nevertheless, are deemed sinful by all the real disciples of Christ; and in the same way we might prove that slave-holding is a sin, even though there were no explicit commands which could be brought to bear upon the subject.

Thus having proved, that no authority whatever can be fairly drawn from either the Old, or New Testaments in favor of American Slavery; a few remarks may now be added to what we have already said, concerning the "Scripture Argument" of our brethren.

1. In the course of their "Appeal," they tell us that the existence of the "relation between the Christian master and the slave, is right;" and speaking of some of the slaves who, in the days of the apostles, got "boxed or cuffed on the ear," they say, "here, again, is a clear discrimination between the rightful existence of the relation in the hands of a Christian master, and its cruelties and iniquities in the hands of the froward." Without stopping to inquire, what it is that makes it wrong for a sinner or heathen to hold the "relation" here spoken of, any more than it is for a Christian to do this, we would beg the reader's attention to the statement so distinctly made in the above quotation, as it is elsewhere in the "Counter Appeal," that the "relation is **RIGHT**;" slaveholding "in the hands of a Christian is **RIGHT**;" nay, our brethren tell us more than once, that "CHRISTIANITY not only permits slaveholding, but in supposable circumstances, **ENJOINS** a **CONTINUANCE** of the master's authority!" And in their "critical canvassing" of one passage, they say again, "This text seems mainly to **ENJOIN** and **SANCTION** the fitting **CONTINUANCE** of their present social relations."

Now let the reader compare the following quotation with the above; it is one of the "results" to which our brethren tell us they have arrived, in concluding their "Scripture Argument." These are their words:—"The letter of the golden rule and the spirit of the gospel, operate with an **IRRESISTIBLE tendency**, to the *amelioration, diminution, and DESTRUCTION* of *slavery*, as a system, holding forth its *continuance*, by the authors of legislation, beyond the time of its practicable removal, a *sin*. With the qualifications, therefore, which we have above stated, we may affirm the proposition, that the *Bible is opposed to slavery*." A most singular "result," this is, surely, for our brethren to arrive at! After filling half of their sheet with what they call a "Scripture argument," the direct and expressed design of which is to prove that "Christianity"—"permits,"—"sanctions," and approves of slaveholding as "**right**" in the hands of "a Christian," and even that it does actually "**ENJOIN** a **CONTINUANCE**" of the system, they finally come to the "conclusion of the whole matter," and tell us that the "Bible is *opposed to slavery*," and that "the spirit of the gospel, with an *irresistible tendency*, will *destroy* the system!"

2. Will our brethren tell us *how* it is, that "the spirit of the gospel operates, with an *irresistible tendency, to destroy*" a "relation" which it "*permits*" and "*SANCTIONS*" as "**RIGHT**" in the sight of God? Nay, by the showing of the "Counter Appeal," the gospel, yes, Christian reader, the "spirit of the gospel," is the very thing which will *perpetuate* and *continue* the slave system as long as the world stands! How so? Why this "Appeal" tells you, that it is the gospel which makes the "relation between master and slave," "**RIGHT**" in the sight of God; it moreover tells you that "Christianity not only *permits*, but in supposable circumstances, positively **ENJOINS** a **CONTINUANCE** of the master's authority!" Hence all slaveholders have only to embrace the gospel, and "Christianity not only "*permits*," but it "*SANCTIONS* their authority" over their slaves, and if they can make themselves believe that it will be the "*less evil*" of the two, they are commanded by the "golden rule," not to attempt "*a revolution*" of the system, but to pray for its continuance, and to do all in their power to perpetuate its existence as long as the world endures!

3. Again: these brethren tell us that one reason why the apos-

ties did not, in their day, "preach emancipation," was because "masters would hardly have consented to claims founded on such authority, and slaves would have been tempted to embrace a religion which asserted their right to freedom." But our brethren in just so many words tell us, that they, themselves, now preach a gospel which, though it does not enjoin immediate emancipation upon the master, yet it holds out a strong temptation for him to embrace it, especially if he have any *doubts* as to the "right" of his "relation" to his slaves; for as soon as he embraces the gospel, that "relation" is "permitted," and "enjoined," as a "rightful existence." But alas! for the poor slaves; they have the greatest inducement to reject the gospel, for they must see at once, that though the moral sense of the whole world *condemns* their chains as *unjust*, yet the "gospel,"—the "spirit of the gospel," "CHRISTIANITY," and "the GOLDEN RULE," "SANCTIONS" them, and if the master thinks best, "ENJOINS" their "CONTINUANCE," beyond the hope of freedom!

4. Once more. The reader will probably recollect, that we have already noticed the place in the "Counter Appeal," where the authors of it say, that we had "conceded" as they thought, "the whole question" at issue. They thought so, it may be; but it so happens, that we now have it in our power to prove that, they themselves, have done this very thing! Let the reader look at the following quotation, and then say who "concedes the whole question, and gives up the whole point at issue." It is one of the "results" to which the brethren tell us they have arrived in the management of their "Scripture Argument," and it reads as follows:—

(F) Christianity, by proclaiming the immortal existence of every human soul, and pronouncing ALL EQUALLY RESPONSIBLE, and EQUALLY VALUABLE in the eye of God, stamps the STIGMA of LIBELOUS ABSURDITY upon the principle, that man can, in nature, be a mere ARTICLE OF PROPERTY. WHATEVER may be the temporary state of SUBJECTION which CHRISTIANITY ITSELF may, in prevention of higher evils, RIGHTFULLY RETAIN in transient existence, it does at the same time, attest the innate ascendancy of his nature, by which he must inevitably rise above this FICTITIOUS and UNNATURAL position of a mere CHATTEL, into an elevation worthy his true character.)

Was ever any thing so "unlike itself!" "Christianity may RIGHTFULLY RETAIN" a man, an immortal being, in SLAVERY,—it may, and it even does justify and sanction a "relation" which holds him as "a chattel personal, in the hands of his master and possessor, TO ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES WHATSOEVER," and at the same time it "fixes a stigma" upon this "relation,"—"pronouncing it LIBELOUS," "ABSURD," "FICTITIOUS" and "UNNATURAL!!!"

But we will not dwell upon a contradiction which must be so evident to every reader, nor will we stop to press it, as we know we might do, to the disadvantage of our brethren; it is sufficient for the reader to see, that the "whole question" at issue, is conceded in the above quotation; the slave laws, as we have shown, establish the "relation" between the master and the slave, which makes the slave in the very *spirit, design, and language* of the law, "a chattel," a "mere article of property" "in the hands of his master and possessor TO ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES WHATSOEVER;" and upon the "principle that man can," in the nature of things, be such an article of property, the brethren who have signed the

"Counter Appeal," tell us in the above quotation, that "CHRISTIANITY STAMPS THE STIGMA OF AN UNNATURAL, FICTIOUS, and LIBELLOUS ABSURDITY!!!"

Alas! for our brethren! Little did they imagine when putting their names to the document which contains the above language, that they were signing the *death warrant* of SLAVERY! nor had they the most distant idea, probably, that they were putting into our hands a "Scripture Argument," sure enough, and one by which they themselves, would enable us to demonstrate the *sin of slaveholding* beyond the possibility of their successful contradiction! And we beg the reader to take this unwary concession, together with the "Argument," of which it is set down as one of the "results," and lay them up in his memory, as an everlasting evidence how utterly inconsistent that "relation" is, with reason and religion, which even the best of men sometimes so unfortunately set themselves to defend!

From the view we have taken of this most singular argument, which our brethren have brought in favor of slaveholding, and from some of the "results" to which they arrive in its management, it only remains for us now to recapitulate the following particulars:—

1. We have shown that our brethren stumble upon the very threshold of the subject, in failing to state the question correctly. We stated in our Appeal (1) that, to "hold property in man, is a *crime*;" but our brethren give a quotation from us, to make it appear as though we simply said, "the slave system is *wrong*."—Our brethren were "wrong" in giving this view of the question; but it was not a "crime."

2. They stumble, again, in the first argument which they adduce upon the question at issue:—1. In taking it for granted, without proof, that when one man steals, or withholds the liberty of another, as in the case of slaveholding, it is *no sin*. 2. In taking it for granted, that when millions of men, women, and children, lose their liberty in this way, it is an evil which is brought upon them by the agency of God. 3. In taking it for granted, that if every slaveholder in this nation were to cease holding property in the human species, it would be attended with more *sin* than the continuance of the slave system. 4. In reasoning from a number of particulars, and inferring from the whole, what is true only of a part—as that, because a government may justly require the services of its subjects for the "general good" of society, it follows, that one man has a *right* to deprive another of his *liberty*, and hold him in *hopeless and unending SLAVERY*. This is an error which is often committed in the course of the "scripture argument," as we doubt not our brethren themselves will see, upon a review of what they have written.

3. They commit themselves, again, in tacitly admitting that the slaves would be justified in rising and killing all their masters, if they thought that "they had a decisive moral certainty that such a revolution would not be less horrible in its effects, than the present endurance of their despotism." This "moral certainty" is the identical principle upon which Nat Turner acted, when he commenced the Southampton insurrection, a few years since!

4. Our brethren beg the question, again, when they reason from "the specific directions of the New Testament," in taking it for

granted, that δοῦλος always signifies one who was the entire property of another; we have proved, that this is not the fact.

5. Granting the premises in this case, the argument in the "Counter Appeal," proves too much; it proves, that the apostles justified, approved, and "sanctioned" a "relation," which authorized every "master" to commit *theft, adultery, and murder*; and the reader must see, that if the apostles did "sanction" such a "relation" as this, it follows as an undeniable consequence, that they did, also, "sanction" every part of which it was composed, and all and singular, the "rights" which it conferred upon the master who held it.

6. But we have proved, that the very "specific texts" which our brethren adduce in favor of the "right" of one man to hold property in another, afford the most conclusive evidence that could be desired, that the apostles did virtually and positively *condemn* this relation, inasmuch as they condemned the "rights," or the very things which it gave every slaveholder a right to do. Those Romans, who held slaves in that "relation" for which our brethren contend, had a "right," in virtue of this "relation," not only "to box" them or "to cuff" them "on the ear," but they were authorized and empowered by this "relation" to *torture* them, to *maim* them, and to *PUT THEM TO DEATH* in any way they chose, and, according to Dr. Taylor's "Elements of Civil Law," those slaves **COULD NOT BE INJURED** in any way. And a "relation" which authorized and justified such *cruelties*, such *horrible*, and, we may add, *diabolical INJUSTICE* as all this, some eight or ten Methodist preachers, tell us, is "sanctioned by the holy apostles," and justified by the testimony of the infinite God! *O tempora! tempora!*

7. Our brethren make a most singular distinction as to the *nature* of this "relation" when held in the hands of different persons; hence they say, that there "is a clear discrimination between the **RIGHTFUL** existence of the relation in the hands of a Christian master, and its cruelties and iniquities in the hands of the froward;" and, accordingly, they charge us with "fallacy," because they think that we, and others, have not founded our reasoning upon this "relation itself" thus distinguished, "but upon extreme cases of licentious and cruel abuse of that relation in the hands of a tyrant."

Now, Christian reader, what say you? Have we not founded our reasoning upon this "relation itself?" Have we even mentioned one single instance of the "abuse of this relation" in the whole course of our remarks? Not we! We deny this charge; and we say that we have confined our arguments to this "relation itself," and to this alone; and we now leave it to our readers to judge whether we have not proved, even by the "scripture argument" of our brethren, that this relation is *malum in se*, just as really as the crimes are, which it authorized and empowered those to commit who held it. This "relation" empowered and authorized the master to commit *theft, adultery, injustice* of every kind, and *murder*, as well as "boxing and cuffing" the slaves "on the ear." Now, could the apostles forbid these things under the penalties of God's displeasure, and yet justify and "sanction the relation" which authorized them?

We say, *No!* Our brethren say, *Yes!*

8. Our brethren contend, that this "relation in the hands of a Christian master is right," because such masters *would not*, or

could not, "abuse" it. But we have shown that, in the days of the apostles, it was not, in any way, possible for slaveholders to abuse it. Nor can any *Christian* slaveholder in this nation, scarcely abuse this relation, except it be in the commission of murder; and he may even do this, if the slave, male or female *resists* him in any thing. He may scourge them at his pleasure; he may yoke them with iron collars; he may compel them to work fifteen hours a day with chains upon their limbs; he may incarcerate them in a prison for life, without even the form of a trial; he may take all the fruit of their labor; he may violate female chastity; he may annihilate the family state, and part those asunder whom God has joined together; he may abrogate the moral government of God over his slaves; he may—nay, he *must*, and he *does*, **WITHHOLD** from them the *Holy Scriptures*, which heaven intended as a gift to every human soul; and he may—he **MUST**, and he **DOES**, **WITHHOLD** from them "all mental" INSTRUCTION in letters, under the penalties of *fine, imprisonment, and death* upon the gallows. All these things he *may* do, and some of them he **MUST** do, and in doing them he *does not abuse* the "relation," which, we are told, the "apostles **PERMITTED**" and "**SANCTIONED**," but he *fulfills* that "relation,"—nay, more, he *abuses* the relation *when he leaves them undone*!

9. Though our brethren have given us a labored "scripture argument," to prove that the "relation" now under notice, was, and is "right" in the sight of God; and though they tell us, repeatedly, that it was justified and "sanctioned by the apostles," yet they finally come to the conclusion that the "Bible is opposed" to it! But how, we would ask,—how can the Bible be "opposed" to that which the Bible says is "right?" If slavery is right now, under all circumstances of the case, it will—under all the "circumstances of the case,"—be right to-morrow, it will be right next year, and "**COUNTER APPEALS**" (not *apologies*,—our brethren do not like to be called "*apologists* for slavery,") may be issued and sent far and wide through the country to show that it is a "**RIGHTFUL EXISTENCE**," and that the apostles "**SANCTIONED**" it, and so we shall have *bonds*, and *chains*, and **SLAVERY FOREVER!!!**

10. But, omitting many other singular things which might be noticed in relation to the "scripture argument" of our brethren, we close this recapitulation by simply referring to the unwaried concession which this "**Counter Appeal**" makes of the whole question at issue! "*Upon the principle that man can, in nature, be a mere article of PROPERTY, Christianity stamps the stigma of a fictitious, UNNATURAL, and LIBELOUS ABSURDITY!*"

Thus ends this "specimen of" a "scripture argument," and here, also, shall end our remarks concerning it.

With the reader's permission, we will now proceed to show, more fully, wherein—

THE BIBLE CONDEMNED THE SYSTEM OF SLAVEHOLDING, AND MAKES IT APPEAR, AS IT CERTAINLY IS, A SIN AGAINST GOD.

We have, already, expressed some of our views, (see Appeal, 11) as to the attempts which many good people have been led to make, in order to press the *Holy Scriptures* into a justification of slavery; but it is pretty certain, that our brethren, whose names are affixed to the "**Counter Appeal**," do not think as we do upon this subject; had they done so, we should not feel ourselves

laid under the necessity of adding any thing more upon the question at issue ; and we hope the Christian reader will believe us when we say, that this is a most *painful* necessity ! How can it be otherwise ? The labor we have to perform is nothing more or less than this ;—it is to convince believers in the Bible, *Christians*, and *Christian ministers*, that the Bible does really *condemn* all sorts of injustice ; that it does positively forbid all sorts of theft, and all kinds of uncleanness, and all kinds of fraud, and all kinds of oppression. It is to convince them, that the Holy Scriptures do really enjoin upon all men the exercise of that *kindness* and *pity*, and *love*, and *good-will* toward men, which are designed by the great and good Being to prevent man from enslaving his fellow-man. And we most candidly confess, that, to us, it is a melancholy and mortifying reflection, that a necessity like this should be put upon us,—of proving a question which was declared to be a “*SELF-EVIDENT*” fact more than fifty years ago, by the assembled *wisdom* and *intelligence* of this whole nation ! Nay, a fact, the truth of which, is attested by our political existence as a people, a fact which is set forth and declared in the Bills of Rights, and in the constitutions of about every State in this Union, and one which has been believed and taught by the wisest and best of men who have ever lived,—and one which is attested and confirmed by the unperverted moral sense of the whole world of mankind ! But so it is ! And hence we cannot help saying, that we come to the performance of the duty which this necessity imposes upon us, with a humbling view of ourselves, as we must and we trust we do feel how liable we, ourselves, are to err and fall into the same, or similar, inconsistencies, which we believe some of our dearest and most respected brethren are now involved. We can appeal to the Searcher of hearts and say, that we love these brethren ! We respect them, and we would do every thing in our power to honor them for their works’ sake ; but how can we yield to them when, through the force of circumstances, they are led to tell us that the *Bible justifies slavery* ; that a “*relation*” between the enslaver and the enslaved, which authorizes the crimes of robbery, injustice, theft, and a thousand other abominations, was *permitted*, *justified*, and *sanctioned* by the apostles of our God ! O, dear brethren ! how can we believe this ! ! How can we, as men, as Christians, and as Christian ministers, yield our influence for one moment to perpetuate such a thought ? Nay, dear brethren, as we love you, as we love the souls of our fellow-men, and as we fear God, we cannot—we cannot do this ! And now, in addition to what we have already said, we beg leave still further to assign the following reasons. We observe them—

1. *That Slaveholding is forbidden in the 8th commandment, which says, Thou SHALT NOT STEAL !* This command would, certainly, have prevented all slaveholding among the Jews, as mild as the system was among them, had it not been for the *express permission* of God ; just the same as the commandment which says, *Thou shalt not kill*, would have prevented the nearest of kin from killing the murderer of his friend, if it had not been for God’s direction and permission in the case. Hence it follows, conclusively, that every human being who has been *enslaved* by the people of this nation, has been made a slave in direct violation of this command, and, also, that all such as are now retained in slavery, are retained, in this condition, in violation of the Divine injunc-

non, which says, **THOU SHALT NOT STEAL!** This consequence, we say, must, of necessity, follow—unless it can be shown, that God has imparted His express permission to the people of this nation to enslave their species; but, we suppose, this will hardly be pretended by any one. We know, indeed, that it is often said, that the laws make the slaves; that it must be right for one man to enslave another, because it is according to law. But who made those laws, by which one-sixth part of this nation are *enslaved*? Why, the slaveholders, to be sure! And where has God given to any man, or community of men, the **right** to make laws which contravene **His LAW?** The fact is, men have no such right; they never did have; and such a right they never can have. And, beside, even if the Deity had ever given any part of this nation permission to enslave some of their species, it would be inconsistent for any of them to do so, till the nation had revoked its Declaration of Independence; for this is the Great Charter upon which all the State rights are founded; and this declares, before heaven and earth, “**that ALL MEN are created EQUAL,**” and “**that they are endowed, by their Creator, with certain UNALIENABLE RIGHTS**”—such “*as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.*”

It is a fact, that the laws of the United States, as well as the laws of other nations, declare, expressly, that the very same thing, of which we are now speaking, when committed upon the high seas, or on the African coast, is **PIRACY**, and punishable with **DEATH!** But here, in this nation, we have about sixty thousand human beings *enslaved* every year; and, many of them, by Christians and professed ministers of the gospel—reduced to involuntary and hopeless bondage! Those who are now held in slavery in this land were not born slaves; that no human being can be born a slave, in the sense in which we now use this term, we have already proved by a quotation from Blackstone, (see Appeal, 25.) And if we say, that some in this nation are, and must be, born slaves, because of the laws which authorize the enslavers to reduce them to this state, then it follows, that the Declaration of Independence referred to above, is *false*, and no State, which has come into existence by virtue of the act set forth in this instrument, has a right to pass the laws which have given one man such power over another.

But, let us suppose one case out of thousands which actually exist, at this time, among the people of this land. Here is a man, who has thirty slaves in his possession; they were “born in his house;” they never were owned by any other “master;” but their *liberty is gone!* Who has got their liberty? Who took it away from them? Who *withholds* it from them? Were they ever paid for the liberty which their “master” has taken away? *No!* Did they give it to him? *No!* Have they forfeited it by crime? *No!* But how, then, came they *destitute of liberty* to read God’s word? *Liberty*—to think for themselves? *Liberty*—to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences? *Liberty*—to obey God in taking care of their wives and families? *Liberty*—to educate their children? *Liberty*—to defend the chastity of their own persons? *Liberty*—to enjoy the fruit of their own toils and labors? How came they **DESTITUTE OF LIBERTY** to do all these things, which the **God of their being gave them a RIGHT to do?** We say, therefore, that the act by which it has been taken from them is **felony against God!** It is **fraud**;

it is theft; it is a direct violation of the command which says, **THOU SHALT NOT STEAL!**

This man, who has usurped the liberty of these souls, it will be granted, we suppose, is an "enslaver," according to "Webster's Dictionary," and he is also a professed Christian; and he can assign this very conclusive reason for stealing the liberty of thirty of God's intelligent creatures, namely,—"if he had not done it, some other person would"—some "froward" or wicked man, perhaps! And how very desirable it must be, according to the reasoning of such men, that all the gambling, and all the traffic in ardent spirits, as well as the use of them, and all the thieving and other crimes, should be done by *Christians*—by *respectable* men—because if *they* do not do these things, *some others*, less Christian than themselves, will do them!

We will suppose these thirty slaves are sold to a second person. Is the person's title to their liberty, who buys them, any better than his who sells them? He buys them, *knowing*, as every man in this nation *knows*, that these slaves have been *unjustly deprived of their LIBERTY*; he knows that he pays them nothing for the loss of it—and he knows that their liberty is a boon which they could not sell if they would—and he knows, further, that no equivalent has been, or ever can be given to them, for it. And yet he buys them, and continues the crime which the seller first began; and he begins the crime in relation to all their children who are born, while they are in his hands. Hence, we say, in view of the premises which we have stated,—if these men, and all such men who possess the liberty of their species in this way, and hold them as their **PROPERTY**, do not, as really and as *criminally*, violate the above command of God, as it is possible for any man to do, then we confess ourselves utterly unable to tell what constitutes a violation of this command.

2. *All slaveholding is forbidden in the 9th commandment, which says, THOU SHALT NOT COVET ANY THING THAT IS THY NEIGHBOR'S!* He who holds his fellow-men in bondage as his property, violates this command, because he does certainly covet some things, which, of right, do, and in the nature of the case, must belong to his neighbor, whom he deprives of his liberty. He covets his neighbor's liberty, and withholds it from him; he covets his neighbor's services, and compels him to work without wages; he covets his neighbor's wife, and frequently takes her from her husband, and sells her into the hands of another by whom she is parted from her husband forever; he covets his neighbor's children, and hence he *enslaves* them, and sometimes sells them and tears them from their parent's embrace forever. The application of this command to the question at issue, cannot be invalidated unless it be shown, that a certain part of the human family are not our "neighbors;" this however we do not believe that any Christian will ever attempt to do, and, hence, we will rest our argument upon this passage as perfectly conclusive. And two out of ten commandments, ought, we should suppose, to satisfy any believer in the Bible, as to the sin of holding property in man.

But we will observe, again,—

3. *All those passages in the Bible are against the Slave-system, which forbid MANSTEALING expressly.* Two of these passages we introduced into the Appeal, (see 3 and 4) but our brethren, it seems, found it not convenient to dispute the arguments which we drew from them, and we are left to conjecture the reason why

they did not. But we will now add one or two more to them, as we desire to convince the Christian reader, that the word of God is not a dead letter in relation to one of the greatest evils that ever disgraced humanity.

4. *The law was made for the disobedient—for murderers of fathers, and murderers of mothers—for whoremongers—for MEN-STEALERS.* 1. Tim. i. 9. The law here referred to, we have quoted in the Appeal, (3, 4;) and we stated there, and we repeat it, that every human being in this land, who is now held by another as his *property*, has been *stolen*.

That one human being may be stolen by another is evident, not only from what we know takes place every day in this country, but also from the express testimony of God which is given in the Bible against this crime. But what constitutes man-theft? We answer, the taking and holding of property in man. Every intelligent being born into the world, possesses by virtue of his existence, the right of *personal security*, the right of *personal liberty*, and the right of *private property*; and of these rights, every one is *unjustly deprived* the moment he is *enslaved*. That "all men are endowed by their Creator," with these rights, is proved not only by the moral government of God, and the unperverted reason of mankind, but also from the fact that men constitute society, and establish forms of government in the exercise of them; for if men do not, by virtue of their existence, possess these rights, before they form society, then it follows, that society can possess no rights of any kind after it is formed, for it is intuitively evident, that men cannot give rights to society, if they themselves do not possess those which we have named, as inherent and unalienable. Hence we believe the reader will find it impossible to suppose a case of *man-theft*, which ever was, or ever can be committed, if it is not a fact, that every enslaved human being in this nation presents a case of this crime. Let him try it, and see to what conclusions any supposable case will carry him.

5. *The Scriptures forbid slaveholding in all those places where they prohibit fraud and oppression.* There are many in the Bible of this kind; take the following as examples:—

Thou shalt not OPPRESS a hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren or of thy strangers;—at his day thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it; for he is poor, and setteth his heart upon it; lest he cry against thee unto the Lord, and it be sin unto thee. Deut. xxiv. 14. Every man commits the sin described in this passage, who keeps back an equivalent for the labors of those whom he employs to do his work for him. Hear God again in another place: *Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go FREE, and that ye break every yoke?* Isa. lviii. 6; and see also the whole of this chapter.

The slaves of this land are OPPRESSED, in their persons, by the cruelties which they suffer, and in having the fruit of their labor taken away without their consent, and never were any class of men OPPRESSED with more injustice and less mercy, than they now are; and God says to their masters, LET THEM GO FREE! He commands us, also, to aid in their deliverance:—*Thus saith the Lord, execute judgment in the morning, and DELIVER him that is spoiled out of the hand of the OPPRESSOR, lest my fury go out like fire, and burn, that none can quench it.* Jer. xxi. 12.

If the following passage does not forbid slaveholding, then we

have yet to learn what sin is forbidden in the Bible:—*Woe unto him that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work.* Jer. xxii. 13. Every slaveholder in this land uses the service of his neighbor without wages, and every body knows that when servants are held as property, they are not paid for their work; and reader, it is the great God, who says to their masters: *Behold the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of sabaoth.* James v. 4.

6. *The slave system is condemned in all those passages which forbid TRADING in the PERSONS OF MEN.* The following passages may be brought to bear against this traffic: “The children also of Judah, and the children of Jerusalem have ye SOLD unto the Grecians;—behold, I will return you RECOMPENCE upon your own head.” Joel iii. 6. “Thus saith the Lord, For three transgressions of Israel, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof: because they SOLD the righteous for silver and the poor for a pair of shoes.” Amos ii. 5. “Thus saith the Lord my God; Feed the flock of the slaughter, whose POSSESSORS slay them, and hold themselves NOT GUILTY; and they that SELL them say, Blessed be the Lord for I am RICH; and their own shepherds pity them not.” Zec. xi. 4. “Against this peremptory and comprehensive scheme of unchristianizing,” which is displayed in the foregoing passages, we are perfectly willing our brethren should publish their “protest,” if they please, and state their “radical objections.” We have many other passages of the very same kind, which we will produce, when these shall have been well digested and disposed of.

7. *All those passages in the Bible, which enjoin upon man the exercise of pity, kindness, and compassion, condemn the system of slavery.* These are too numerous to be quoted here. One we may give, however, as an example:—“And if thy brother be waxen poor, and falleth in decay with thee, then thou shalt relieve him:—and if thy brother be waxen poor and be sold unto thee, then thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond servant.” Lev. xxv. 35.

The enslavers of this nation do compel more than two millions of their brethren to serve as bond-servants, and they pay them nothing for their work.

8. *The spirit and design of the gospel is against this system.* All slaveholders have it in their power—and many, if not most of them, do prevent the fulfilling of Christ’s last command to his disciples, that his gospel should be preached to every creature. Volumes might be filled with testimonies from slave-owners themselves, to demonstrate this fact. Take the following in evidence. It is from a sermon preached before two associations of planters in Georgia, in 1831, by the Rev. C. C. Jones.

“Generally speaking, the slaves appear to us to be without God and without hope in the world, a nation of heathen in our very midst. We cannot cry out against the Papists for withholding the Scriptures from the common people, and keeping them in ignorance of the way of life; for we withhold the Bible from our servants and keep them in ignorance of it, while we will not use the means to have it read and explained to them. The cry of our perishing servants comes up to us from the midst of their ignorance, and superstition, and adultery, and lewdness.”

The Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, declare as follows:—“Who would credit it, that in these years of revivals and benevolent

efforts, in this CHRISTIAN republic, there are over *two millions of human beings* in the condition of HEATHEN, and in some respects in a WORSE CONDITION. From long continued and close observation, we believe that their *moral* and *religious* condition is such, that they may justly be considered the *heathen* of this Christian country, and will bear a comparison with the *heathen of any country in the world*. *The negroes are destitute of the gospel, and EVER WILL BE UNDER THE PRESENT STATE OF THINGS.*" Such, Christian reader, with a few exceptions we grant, such is the moral condition of millions in this land, who are thus *debased, ignorant and wretched*, and *debarred from reading the word of God*, by that "relation" which many good people would have us believe is "permitted and sanctioned" by the Holy Scriptures! Think on the condition of these *heathen*, and remember, that *every one of their masters holds in his hands the tremendous power of keeping them in this condition, and of shutting out from their souls the knowledge of God, and the vast concerns of an eternal world!* We remark again:—

9. *The conditions of forgiveness and salvation are utterly irreconcileable with holding property in man.* What else can be the meaning of these fearful words: "Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath *aught* against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; *first* be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Mat. v. 23. Let those who dispute us here, show, that the poor slave has *nothing* against his brother, (Christian or Minister as he may profess to be,) who *withholds* from him his *liberty*, keeps him in *ignorance*, takes the fruit of his labor, and furnishes him with *no bible*! Has he *nothing* against him? *Nothing* against him who robs him of his *LIBERTY*? *Nothing* against him who takes away his wife? *Nothing* against him who steals his children and sells them into hopeless bondage? *Nothing* against him who takes *all the fruit* of his unrequited labor? *Nothing* against him who *crushes* his mind with *ignorance*, and *debars* him from searching the word of God? Then, indeed, are the scriptures without sense to us, and it is impossible to prove by them, that the God of truth and justice has any thing against any sinner who lives upon the face of the earth!

We might go on to quote no inconsiderable part of the Bible, but we forbear; we believe that the foregoing are to the point, and directly to the point at issue between us and our brethren; and, Christian reader, we bespeak for them a candid and prayerful reading, before you yield your assent to that doctrine which says that the Bible, that blessed book from which the above are taken, justifies, permits and sanctions a relation which *withholds* the Bible from millions of your species,—a relation which crushes the intellects of God's intelligent creatures, and reduces them to wretchedness and vice in this world, and carries them down to unending despair in the world to come!

We have now to observe that—

THE GENERAL RULE IN THE DISCIPLINE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, IS OPPOSED TO SLAVEHOLDING.

This we think we have already shown (see Appeal 12) but the remarks of our brethren make it necessary for us to add a few words on this subject.

1. The "Counter Appeal" informs us, that the only design of our General Rule was, to "forbid the slave trade." But if our brethren are correct in this explanation, then it follows, that the members of our Church may *STEAL* as many human beings as they please, and make slaves of them, for if they neither "buy" or "sell" them, they do not contravene any rule in our Discipline, against slavery!

2. They tell us again, that our General Rule was not designed to prevent, and that it does not actually *forbid*, "even every case of *internal slave trade*;" in other words, that it simply forbids the "*reducing* of those to slavery," by "buying or selling" them, who were before free. But we would inquire, how any one can possibly be *reduced* to slavery by his being bought or sold merely, who was not a slave before? Is it not perfectly evident to any one who reflects upon the subject for one moment, that no one can be *bought* or *sold*, till *after* he is *REDUCED* to *slavery*? So it must follow according to this "critical canvassing" of our Rule, that the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church may "*enslave* men, women, and children," by scores, and even hundreds, but if they do not "buy" or "sell" them, till they are actually reduced to slavery, (a thing which, in the very nature of the case, cannot be done) they contravene no rule in our excellent form of Discipline! They may kidnap human beings and make slaves of them, or they may buy those whom they know have been kidnapped and enslaved, and our general rule, which forbids the "*INTENTION*" of slavery, cannot be brought to bear against them! The Methodist who can receive these sayings, let him receive them.

3. We do not pretend to have a better understanding than others as to what the real design of this rule was, when it was first added to the number of our General Rules; but we suppose that it was designed, as far as possible, to *PREVENT* *slaveholding* and *slavery* in our Church, precisely the same as each of the other rules were designed to *prevent* the crimes that are mentioned in them. We have a rule against profane swearing, and we believe that it was designed to prevent this crime in all its forms, and every thing which leads to it; we have another against Sabbath breaking, and we suppose it was designed to prevent this crime in all its forms as well as every thing which leads to it; and so of the general rule against "*enslaving* men, women, and children." If this rule was not designed to prevent *SLAVERY* in the Church, what was it designed for? To say that it was "simply designed to prevent some cases of the internal slave trade," or in other words, that it was designed simply to prevent our members from making slaves of men by buying or selling them, is to say, that it was designed to prevent what we believe never did and never can take place. "Men, women, and children," are not reduced to slavery by being bought or sold simply, but they are bought and sold, because they have been before reduced to this state.

Hence, we think the fact, that our General Rule prohibits the "*INTENTION*" of *enslaving* the human species, leaves no room to doubt but that it was designed to prevent the existence of the "*great evil*" in the Church. Suppose, for instance, a member of our church *steals* "men, women, or children," with the "*intention*" of enslaving them, does he not contravene our Rule? Is not the "*intention*" in this case as criminal as though he bought them with such a design? Or, suppose he receive them as a gift from a third person, with the "*intention to enslave*" them? Does the manner

of his coming into the possession of them, alter the nature of an *intention* to *enslave* them? We think not; nor can we conceive how, in the nature of things, it can be right for one man to continue a thing which it was a **CRIME** in another to begin. If it is a crime for one man to make a slave of his fellow man, the conclusion is irresistible, that it is no less so for another to continue him in this state.

4. The remarks, which our brethren have given us on the word "enslaver," we hope, are not to be taken as a fair "specimen" of their skill in English lexicography; though they may still persist in thinking that a man who holds fifty of his species in slavery, and makes slaves of all the children of such, is not an "enslaver" according to "Mr. Webster." These fifty persons are *enslaved*, are they not? And who *enslaves* them? Why, the man who *now deprives* them of their *liberty*, to be sure. Well, and is he not an "enslaver"? We think he is, just as really an "enslaver," as any other person that could be named.

5. The "Counter Appeal" makes an attempt to show that those preachers of our Church, who abrogated some rules which were against slavery in our Discipline, were at the same time as *much convinced* of the *sin of slaveholding* as either Wesley, or any of his coadjutors were; but we think this attempt an utter failure. We no more believe this, than we do that our Rule against the use of spirituous liquors could now be banished entirely from the Discipline, by those who are as much in favor of the temperance reformation, and opposed to intemperance, as Wesley was. There are the rules, (see Appeal, 18, 19,) and the fact that they have long since been left out of the Discipline, will speak for itself. We have our fears as to the true reasons why they were left out, and the "Counter Appeal" of our brethren has but confirmed them. They tell us that the General Conference was "convinced as much as ever, that the **whole fabric** of *slavery* was an evil;" yet they themselves, think that some "parts of the system" are "just and humane," so much so that the Discipline never was *designed* to **PREVENT** its existence in the Church! From this showing of our brethren, it seems but too evident that they do not think as the great body of Methodist preachers did, upon this subject, fifty years ago!

The sentiments of Wesley, and Dr. Clarke, and the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England, the reader will have seen in the Appeal, and we do not wonder that our brethren, in concluding their remarks, should start back a little, when they found themselves so very wide from the course pursued by Wesley and his successors in England. Among many other wholesome truths which they read in the extracts we have given, was the following testimony of the whole Conference of Wesleyan Ministers, against the very principles advocated in their "Counter Appeal," and the course which its authors have taken in sending it out to the world:—"That the Conference *fully concur* in those *strong moral views* of the **EVIL** of *slavery* which are taken by their fellow Christians of different denominations—and that they express in this manner [by petitions to parliament] their *sympathy* with an *INJURED portion of their race*, and their **ABHORRENCE** of **ALL THOSE PRINCIPLES** ON WHICH IT IS ATTEMPTED TO DEFEND THE SUBJECTION OF HUMAN BEINGS to *hopeless and interminable slavery*."

No wonder that this "Counter Appeal" winds up with an attempt to make the reader believe that our extracts from Wesley, Clarke, and Watson, favored the views of those who put their names to it!

But mark you, good reader, the "Counter Appeal" gives us no extracts from either Wesley, or Dr. Clarke, nor from Watson, nor indeed from any other Methodist writer, in favor of the "relation" for which our brethren argue; they can quote from no "Counter Appeals" published in England. No! not a book, nor a tract, nor a sermon, nor an "extra" paper of any kind, was ever published by Methodist preachers in England in favor of the "rightful existence" of slavery, nor against the feeblest efforts of those who undertook to enlist the prayers and Christian efforts of their brethren for the purpose of opposing it!

Concerning the measures which have been taken by many good people to prevent us in the discharge of what we believe to be our solemn duty in relation to the sin of slaveholding and its remedy, we did design to offer a few remarks to the reader. But the want of room compels us to submit the question without them. Had the paper upon which we have been remarking, expressed any sympathy for the millions in this land who are in *bonds*, had it responded to our request, that prayer should be made to God for them, —had it even hinted, for our encouragement, to any Christian action which ought to be brought to bear against the ~~great~~ EVIL of *slavery*, less painful, indeed, would have been the duty which we have now striven to perform. It is true, this paper does seem to change its voice, almost in the very last paragraph, as from regret for what it had said before;—it calls upon the members of our Church, who live at the South, "now to emulate the memorable stand of our brethren in England," and "take the *lead* in the work of universal emancipation"! And suppose our good brethren at the South were to comply with this invocation, and express, as "our brethren in England" have done, "*their utter ABHORRENCE OF ALL THOSE PRINCIPLES*" upon which this "Counter Appeal" has "*attempted to defend*" the "relation" between the enslaver and the enslaved, and "the subjection of human beings to the rightful existence" of slavery? What then! Would the signers of this "Counter" be found among the number of those "who, with the name of Wesley upon their banners, and his spirit in their hearts, would be *leading* on the foremost van?" Or, would they be too busily engaged in writing "Counter Appeals," for the purpose of declaring their "*dissent*" and "*entering their protest*" against a few of their brethren, who had been praying for the arrival of the world's JUBILEE, and using their humble efforts to bring on the work of "UNIVERSAL EMANCIPATION?"

S. W. WILLSON,
LA ROY SUNDERLAND,
GEORGE STORRS,
A. D. MERRILL,
JARED PERKINS.

April 22, 1835.

This book should be returned to
the Library on or before the last date
stamped below.

A fine is incurred by retaining it
beyond the specified time.

Please return promptly.

~~MAR 17 '62 H~~

~~APR 15 '62 H~~

~~CANCELLED~~

~~JUL - 3 1989~~

~~JUL 28 1989~~

~~2893780~~

~~WIDENER~~
~~JUL 11 1989~~
~~CANCELLED~~
~~AUG 11 1989~~

Widener Library

3 2044 090 103 847